

LAW REVERSIONARY INTEREST SOCIETY, LIMITED.

24, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, W.C.

ESTABLISHED 1868.

Capital ... £400,000
 Debentures and Debenture Stock ... £208,130
REVERSIONS BOUGHT. LOANS MADE THEREON.
 Proposal Forms and full information may be had at the Society's Office.
 W. OSCAR NASH, F.I.A., Actuary and Secretary.

COUNTY FIRE OFFICE,

50, REGENT STREET, W., AND 14, CORNHILL, E.C., LONDON.

FOUNDED 1807.

EXCEPTIONAL ADVANTAGES TO PERMANENT POLICY-HOLDERS.

LIBERAL TERMS TO SOLICITORS INTRODUCING BUSINESS.

For Rates and Full Particulars apply to

THE SECRETARIES.

THE LAW GUARANTEE AND TRUST SOCIETY, LIMITED,

SUBSCRIBED CAPITAL - £1,000,000. PAID-UP - £100,000.
 RESERVE FUND - £118,000.

FIDELITY GUARANTEES OF ALL KINDS. ADMINISTRATION AND LUNACY BONDS. MORTGAGE, DEBENTURE, LICENSE, AND CONTINGENCY INSURANCE. TRUSTESHIPS FOR DEBENTURE-HOLDERS, &c.

HEAD OFFICE: 40, Chancery-lane, W.C. | CITY OFFICE: 56, Moorgate-street, E.C.

IMPORTANT TO SOLICITORS

In Drawing LEASES or MORTGAGES of LICENSED PROPERTY

To see that the Insurance Covenants include a policy covering the risk of LOSS OR FORFEITURE OF THE LICENSE.

Suitable clauses, settled by Counsel, can be obtained on application to THE LICENSES INSURANCE CORPORATION AND GUARANTEE FUND, LIMITED,

24, MOORGATE STREET, LONDON, E.C.

Mortgages Guaranteed on Licensed Properties promptly, without special valuation and at low rates.

LEGAL AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

ESTABLISHED OVER HALF A CENTURY.

10, FLEET STREET, LONDON.

FREE,
SIMPLE,

THE
PERFECTED SYSTEM
 OF
LIFE ASSURANCE.

AND
SECURE.

FUNDS - £3,000,000. INCOME - £390,000.
 YEARLY NEW BUSINESS - £1,000,000. BUSINESS IN FORCE - £11,700,000.

TRUSTEES.

The Right Hon. Lord HALSBURY (Lord High Chancellor of England).
 The Hon. Mr. Justice KENWICK.
 The Right Hon. Sir JAMES PARKER, Bt., G.C.B., D.C.L.
 WILLIAM WILLIAMS, Esq.
 RICHARD PENNINGTON, Esq.

DIRECTORS.

Bacon, His Honour Judge.
 Davey, The Right Hon. Lord.
 Danks, The Right Hon. Sir James Parker, G.C.B., D.C.L.
 Ellis-Davies, Edmund Henry, Esq.
 Finch, Arthur J., Esq.
 Frere, Geo. Edgar, Esq.
 Garth, The Right Hon. Sir Richard, G.C.
 Healey, C. E. H. Chadwyck, Esq., G.C.
 Johnson, Charles P., Esq.
 Kenwick, The Hon. Mr. Justice.
 Masterman, Henry Chauncy, Esq.
 Mathew, The Hon. Mr. Justice.
 Meek, A. Grant, Esq. (Deceased).
 Mellor, The Right Hon. John W., G.C., M.P.
 Mills, Richard, Esq.
 Morrell, Frederic F., Esq. (Oxford).
 Pennington, Richard, Esq.
 Rowcliffe, W., Esq.
 Saltwell, Wm. Henry, Esq.
 Trevelick, R. W., Esq.
 Williams, Homer, Esq.
 Williams, William, Esq.

VOL. XLVI., No. 12.

The Solicitors' Journal and Reporter.

LONDON, JANUARY 18, 1902.

* * The Editor cannot undertake to return rejected contributions, and copies should be kept of all articles sent by writers who are not on the regular staff of the JOURNAL.

Contents.

CURRENT TOPICS	189	LAW SOCIETIES	197
PREPAYMENT OF SUMS COVENANTED IN A MARRIAGE SETTLEMENT TO BE PAID AT A SPECIFIED TIME	192	MR. JUSTICE WALTON ON LORD RUSSELL OF KILLLOWEN	197
RIGHTS OF ACTION IN BANKRUPTCY	193	LEGAL NEWS	197
REVIEWS	194	COURT PAPERS	198
CORRESPONDENCE	195	WINDING UP NOTICES	204
NEW ORDERS, &c.	195	CREDITORS' NOTICES	204
		BANKRUPTCY NOTICES	205

Cases Reported this Week.

<i>In the Solicitors' Journal.</i>		Boardman v. Scott & Whitworth	184
Dean and Chapter of Chester and Others v. Smelting Corporation	196	Boles and British Land Co.'s Contract, In re	185
Poisson v. Robertson	199	Dunn, In re. Ex parte The Senior Official Receiver	188
The Urban District Council of Esher and the Dittons v. Marks	196	Fogley v. Phillips	184
White v. Harrow	198	Huxtable, In re. Huxtable v. Crawford	185
<i>In the Weekly Reporter.</i>		Jones v. Humphrey	191
A Debtor, In re. Ex parte The Petitioning Creditors	182	Poisson and Woods v. Robertson and Turvey	186
Bogot Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Clipper Pneumatic Tyre Co.	177	Rex v. Justices of Essex	188
Birch v. Birch and Another	192	The Spiral Globe (Limited), In re	187
		Thurston v. Nottingham Permanent Benefit Building Society	179

CURRENT TOPICS.

IT IS ANNOUNCED that Master WILBERFORCE has been temporarily appointed to assist in the organization of the new Taxation Board of the Supreme Court. The board will consist of all the Chancery Taxing Masters and three of the King's Bench Masters.

WE ARE glad to announce the appointment of Mr. GEORGE ANTHONY KING, M.A., solicitor, of 66, Cannon-street, E.C., as a Master of the King's Bench Division, in succession to Mr. GEORGE POLLOCK. Mr. KING (who is the son of Mr. GEORGE FARQUHARSON KING, of the firm of Messrs. West, King, Adams, & Co., but has carried on business separately from that firm), was admitted in 1885. He has had a good general practice, and is a notary; this being, we believe, the first instance of the appointment of a London notary as a Master of the King's Bench Division.

THE NEW Patent Office Library, of which we gave a full description some weeks ago (*ante*, p. 7), was opened for public use on Thursday in last week; and some idea may be formed of the extent to which the new buildings, with their increased space and commodious arrangements, affect the general convenience from the fact that the average attendance of visitors from the 9th to the 11th inst. was no less than 2,339. We understand that the new catalogue, or "press book," as it is called, is now completed. This contains references to some 400,000 patented inventions.

IT WILL be seen from the notice under the Colonial Stock Act, 1900, which we print elsewhere, that 4 per cent. Inscribed Ceylon Stock (1934) and 3 per cent. Inscribed Ceylon Stock (1940) have been added to the investments authorized by section 2 (2) of the Trustee Act, 1898. Last year, it will be remembered, certain stocks of the Dominion of Canada and of New Zealand were added to the list (45 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 149).

IN A letter on the circuit system, contributed to the *Times* this week, "An Ex-President of the Incorporated Law Society" quotes from Lord RUSSELL of KILLLOWEN's recently-published life a diary of the last circuit travelled by that eminent judge. It would not, of course, be fair to take it as typical of judicial

life on circuit, but it serves as an amusing contrast to the experiences which Mr. Justice GRANTHAM lately published to the world. The late Lord Chief Justice left London for Newtown on the 5th of July and returned on the 25th. The entries relating to the intervening three weeks are a record chiefly of white gloves, "free days," and excursions. Even at towns where there was business, the allotted time was too much. It is pleasant to think that Lord RUSSELL, after his arduous life, found his North Wales circuit so easy. Excursions to Dolgelly and Barmouth are distinctly preferable to working in town in July. But while the circuit was probably exceptional, the incident serves to illustrate the continual waste of time and judicial force which the system entails.

IN THE case of *Dodson v. Downey* (50 W. R. 57) FARWELL, J., applied to the purchase of a partnership share the principle that the purchaser of property is bound to indemnify the vendor against the liabilities which are incident to the property. This has long been recognized law with respect to the purchase of an equity of redemption. Although the purchaser enters into no express obligation to save the vendor harmless from the mortgage, yet the court, said Lord ELDON, L.C., in *Waring v. Ward* (7 Ves., p. 337), "if he receives possession, and has the profits, would, independent of contract, raise upon his conscience an obligation to indemnify the vendor against the personal obligation to pay the money due upon the vendor's transaction of mortgage; for being become the owner of the estate, he must be presumed to intend to indemnify the vendor against the mortgage." In regard to a partnership share FARWELL, J., based the obligation of the purchaser to indemnify the vendor against the partnership liabilities upon the ordinary duty of a *cestui que trust* to indemnify the trustee. Upon the making of the contract of purchase the beneficial interest in the partnership share vests in the purchaser, and the vendor becomes a trustee for him and is entitled to be indemnified. The principle was illustrated a year ago by the judgment of the Judicial Committee in *Hardoon v. Belilios* (49 W. R. 209), where the *cestui que trust* of shares was held to be bound to indemnify the trustee against calls. If the *cestui que trust* has himself created the trust, the trustee's right of indemnity is not limited to the trust property. This condition is satisfied in the case of the purchaser of property, who by his own act draws to himself the beneficial interest and converts the vendor into a trustee; and he cannot avoid coming under the liability to indemnify his trustee. FARWELL, J., accordingly held in *Dodson v. Downey* that the purchaser of the partnership share was bound to indemnify the vendor, and further—in this following *Bridgman v. Daw* (40 W. R. 255) as to the purchase of an equity of redemption—that the purchaser could insist upon the insertion of an express covenant of indemnity in the assignment.

LAST WEEK (*ante*, p. 175) we printed four rules of procedure signed, and declared urgent, by the Lord Chancellor under the Rules Publication Act, 1893, and the Youthful Offenders Act, 1901 (1 Edw. 7, c. 20), one of the most difficult to construe, and one of the most important, Acts of last session, and perhaps fuller of incorporations of other Acts by reference than any Act we have seen of recent years—which is saying a great deal. The 10th section of the Act enacts that "the power to make rules under section 29 of the Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1879, shall extend to making rules for regulating the procedure under this Act, and for prescribing anything which may under this Act be prescribed"; and section 29 of the Act of 1879 confers the rule-making power on the "Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain," and adds that any rule made is to be laid before both Houses of Parliament "as soon as may be after it is made, if Parliament be then sitting, or if not then sitting, within one month after the commencement of the then next session of Parliament." This provision has the effect of bringing into operation the 1st section of the Rules Publication Act, 1893, which enacts that "at least forty days before making any statutory rules" to which that section applies, notice of the proposal to make the rules, and of the place where copies of the draft rules may be

obtained, shall be published in the *London Gazette*; and that copies of the draft rules are to be obtainable during the forty days by "any public body," with the view that any "public body interested" may make suggestions upon the draft rules to the authority making them with the statutory right of having such suggestions duly considered—a provision which was successfully taken advantage of in connection with draft rules framed under the Law of Distress Amendment Act 1895, but not, so far as we are aware, in connection with rules under any other statute. The procedure under the Act of 1893 being somewhat dilatory, it is provided by section 2 of that Act that—

Where a rule-making authority certifies, that on account of urgency or any special reason, any rule should come into immediate operation, it shall be lawful for such authority to make any such rules to come into operation forthwith as provisional rules, but such provisional rules shall only continue in force until rules have been made in accordance with the foregoing provision of this Act.

The rules under the Youthful Offenders Act are, therefore, though fully and legally in force, as yet provisional only, and liable to be supplemented or replaced by another set of rules to be hereafter more regularly made, after, it may be, consideration of suggestions by some "public body interested"—an expression which would, we presume, include any court of quarter sessions. The provisional rules, which deal with the mode of service of orders of maintenance on parents, with the time of making an "application against" an order under section 2, and the security which may be ordered to be given by parents, are not of very much importance in themselves, and it would have been a much neater piece of legislation to incorporate them in the Act itself, giving the now rule-making authority power to alter them if and as deemed desirable. This would have been much better than calling into operation the elaborate machinery of the 29th section of the Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1879, and of the Rules Publication Act, 1893—the latter of which Acts could not with much practical benefit be brought to bear upon the criticism of such numerous and minute forms as the 4th of the new rules under the Youthful Offenders Act has called into existence.

AN INTERESTING decision as to the admissibility of evidence is reported from the United States. The facts are not important, nor are they easy to understand without a somewhat accurate knowledge of the law as to elections in the States. The point, however, may be shortly stated thus—where the absence of a criminal intention in the doing of an act charged is set up as a defence, is a statement by the accused as to his intention, made before the commission of the act, relevant to prove the intention? On appeal, it was decided that evidence of the statement was admissible. There does not seem to be any reported English case directly in point. According to Stephens' Digest of the Law of Evidence, "every admission is deemed to be a relevant fact as against the person by or on whose behalf it is made, but not in his favour unless it is, or is deemed to be, relevant for some other reason." Now if a person says that he is going to commit a certain act, and goes on to state with what intention he is about to commit that act, proof of this statement would be clearly admissible if the intention admitted were a criminal intention. If that intention were not criminal, the admission would be in the defendant's favour and therefore not relevant according to the general rule. It may, however, be relevant "for some other" reason, and it is submitted that it is relevant because it is a statement as to intention made before the act was committed. There is always a difficulty in deciding how far evidence otherwise irrelevant to the issue of guilty or not guilty, is admissible to shew intention. In the recent case it was argued that, as the evidence tendered consisted of evidence of a conversation between the accused and the witness, it was inadmissible as being merely hearsay. This, however, is not a question of hearsay at all, and cannot be answered by the rules established as to that class of evidence. It is clear that when the evidence is that of a conversation, the words used by both parties to the conversation must be proved to make the conversation intelligible. It is only on this ground that the witness can be allowed to prove his own part in that conversation; the words of the prisoner

alone and out of conceal and A. viction a out a pra was going he had night, it artificial obvious O's evid intention remarka submitte

ALTHO reducing honesty WILLS, J. the crim which co was con draw att danger o matters, very oft those w. Rex v. a habeas been cot the man and the It was be so by money o law of of Eng respect offence Division commit sufficient be limit acknowled his bank believes in the morally deposite learned in such criminal son guilt he has o other fr as such persons the pub demands bank ex fairly an receive deposite is submi If the m is a mer personal It, how partner the sum statute.

IN TH elsewhe

alone are relevant. Now suppose A. to take B.'s horse out of his stable by night, without B.'s consent, and to conceal it in his own stable. This is *prima facie* larceny, and A. might have very great difficulty in resisting a conviction and in convincing a jury that he was only carrying out a practical joke upon B. If, however, A. had told C. that he was going to take the horse in order to frighten B. into thinking he had been robbed, and that he would put it back the next night, it would be extremely unjust if C. were forbidden by the artificial rules of evidence from giving evidence of such an obviously important fact. If his intention were really innocent, C.'s evidence would be probably the only possible proof of that intention. If there is no English case in point, it is somewhat remarkable that the question has not been raised. It is submitted, however, that the American decision is right.

ALTHOUGH the Larceny Act, 1901, has done something towards reducing their number, there are still many acts of gross dishonesty for which no punishment can be inflicted at law. WILLS, J., some time ago stated that a friend of his, eminent in the criminal law, had made out a list of the iniquitous things which could be done in England with impunity as far as the law was concerned. He had intended to publish this list in order to draw attention to the defects of our law, but considering the danger of drawing the attention of certain individuals to such matters, he had given up that intention. Extradition cases very often point out these defects in a manner not pleasant to those who are proud of English law. This week the case of *Res v. Dix* supplied an example. The proceedings were for a *habeas corpus* to obtain the release of the defendant, who had been committed for extradition to the United States. He was the manager and president of a bank in the State of Washington, and the first charge on which he was committed was larceny. It was alleged that the bank was insolvent, and known to be so by the defendant, but nevertheless he received a sum of money on deposit, and such receiving amounts to larceny by the law of Washington. Is it, however, an offence by the law of England? If not, extradition cannot be ordered in respect of it. The Attorney-General admitted that it was no offence in this country, and his admission was accepted by the Divisional Court without further discussion. The defendant was committed also upon another charge, which the court held to be sufficient to justify extradition, but ordered the committal to be limited to this second charge. It has, therefore, been acknowledged in the face of the world that if a banker, knowing his bank to be insolvent, accepts a deposit from a person who believes the bank to be sound, the banker is guilty of no crime in the eyes of the English law. And yet in such a case he morally steals the money, by receiving it knowing that the depositor cannot ever recover it. With all due deference to the learned Attorney-General, it seems to be quite arguable that in such a case the banker may bring himself within the criminal law. Section 13 of the Debtors Act, 1869, makes any person guilty of a misdemeanor "if in incurring any debt or liability he has obtained credit under false pretences or by means of any other fraud." Now, does not a banker, who holds himself out as such and as ready and willing to receive the money of other persons in the ordinary course of such business, represent to the public that he is solvent and able to meet the ordinary demands of his customers? No one would deposit money in a bank except in the belief that the bank was solvent, and it is fairly arguable that the mere fact of keeping a bank open to receive deposits is a representation of solvency. Accepting a deposit is obtaining credit, and if the representation is false, it is submitted there may be a misdemeanor under the statute. If the manager who accepts a deposit under such circumstances is a mere servant of a corporation, credit is not given to him personally, and the criminal liability is much more doubtful. If, however, he is himself the proprietor of the bank or a partner in the bank, so that he becomes personally liable for the sum deposited, then, it is submitted, he is liable under the statute.

IN THE CASE of *Esher Urban District Council v. Marks* (reported elsewhere) Mr. Justice WALTON on the 11th inst. delivered an

interesting judgment as to the liability of the occupier of lands to repair a road *ratione tenuræ*. It is generally accepted that this liability can only be established by evidence of immemorial usage, and that if it is shown that the usage commenced since the reign of RICHARD I., the attempt to establish the liability fails: see *Res v. Hayman* (M. & M. 401), *Res v. Hatfield* (4 B. & A. 75). But prescription implies some legal origin, such as, for instance, a grant from the Crown; it would seem to follow that where such a legal origin arising within the period of legal memory can be shown, the liability may be established without appealing to prescription. The *Esher* case was a case of this description, and it also throws considerable light on the proceedings by which an old highway could be legally stopped up before the passing of the Highway Act, 1835, which now applies to such proceedings. The initial step was to sue out a writ *ad quod damnum*; this was done in 1773 by the then owner of the estate of which the lands now in the occupation of the defendant to the present proceedings form part. The object of the writ was to ascertain by the verdict of a jury whether the way which it was desired to stop up could be so dealt with without injury to the king or any other. By virtue of the writ, an inquisition was held, and the jurors returned a verdict to the effect that no one would be prejudiced if the road were stopped up, provided the owner made another road in his own lands, such new road to be for ever repaired by him, his heirs and assigns. The inquisition and the return to it were then enrolled at quarter sessions. Documentary evidence of these proceedings was forthcoming, but the licence from the Crown, which would thereupon have been granted as a matter of course, could not be traced. It was, however, clear that the old road was stopped and the new road set out as directed by the verdict, and that it had since been repaired by the owners of the adjoining land and not by the highway authority; and the learned judge had no difficulty in finding that the licence was actually granted. In so finding he is supported by the recent decision in which the court presumed after long user of a highway that the specific requirements of the Highway Act, 1835, had been complied with so as to make it repairable by the public: *Leigh District Council v. King* (1901, 1 Q. B. 747). A further point of some importance was decided in the *Esher* case—viz., that, where the original estate to which the liability attached had been divided amongst several, the occupier of each portion of it became subject to the entire liability, with a right of contribution from the other occupiers. The result was that the district council, who, on the failure of the defendant to repair the road newly set out in 1774, had done the repairs themselves, were entitled to recover the expenses from the defendant as the "person liable to repair" within the meaning of the Local Government Act, 1894, s. 25 (2); this section gives this right to the highway authority in the case of a highway repairable *ratione tenuræ*.

QUESTIONS relating to the remuneration of auctioneers where no special agreement is proved will always attract the attention of the profession, and we have read with some interest the case of *Stock v. Tremain*, which was heard in the Edmonton County Court on the 6th of January. The action was brought by the plaintiff, an auctioneer, to recover £57 19s. 3d. for money paid at the request of the defendants in respect of advertisements in newspapers, preparing particulars and conditions of sale, and out-of-pocket expenses in reference to offering for sale by auction property at Finchley, Tottenham, and Edmonton. It was not disputed that the defendants had employed the plaintiff to offer the property, which comprised thirty-five houses, at a sale which had been arranged by the plaintiff for the 9th of January, 1901. The plaintiff inspected the property for the purpose of advising the defendants as to the reserve prices, which he accordingly furnished to them. He also prepared the particulars of sale, sending a proof to the solicitor for the defendants, who returned it with the conditions, and he advertised the sale in a number of London newspapers. On the day before the sale, the plaintiff received a letter from the defendants stating the figures at which they fixed the reserve prices, which were higher than those previously advised by the plaintiff. Owing, as the plaintiff contended, to these figures

being unreasonably high, the sale was abortive. The plaintiff had the houses on his books for some months afterwards, endeavouring to dispose of them privately; but no sale having resulted, he brought the action. The defendants sought to prove a special agreement under which, in the events which occurred, the plaintiff was not entitled to recover. The judge, however, found that the agreement was not proved, and upon this finding we have much difficulty in seeing that there could be any further defence to the action.

THE RIGHT of agents to be reimbursed all their advances, expenses, and disbursements, made in the course of their agency on account of and for the benefit of their principals, cannot be disputed, and in the particular case of auctioneers the general usage is that if property offered for sale is not sold, the expenses of advertisements, printing, surveys, and disbursements are charged. This usage is approved by the statute scale of charges on sale by commission in bankruptcy cases, which provides that if property is not sold, the expenses are to be charged and a fee at the discretion of the taxing officer. The judge, however, considered that it was owing to the act of the defendants in fixing the reserved prices which the bidding at the auction did not reach, that no sale occurred, and that this circumstance affected the right of the plaintiff to be reimbursed the expenses which he had incurred. But even assuming that the reserved prices had been fixed by the plaintiff, we cannot think that this circumstance would by itself have affected his right to recover. The judge, in his judgment, added: "It was contended before me that a principal can at any time revoke the auctioneer's authority to sell, and the auctioneer can in such case have no claims either for commission or expenses incurred in preparing for the auction sale. I can find no authority to support such contention in the case of an auctioneer. . . . *Simpson v. Lamb* (17 C. B. 603) was relied upon by the counsel for the defendants. That case, however, had no reference to the case of an auctioneer, and it did not, I think, expressly decide that, in case of a revocation of an agent's authority, the agent was not entitled to be indemnified in respect of expenses incurred in the course of such agency unless the terms of the original employment provided that the auctioneer should have no claim for expenses notwithstanding the revocation. The plaintiff in that action only claimed the commission, and made no claim in respect of actual expenses. The court in that case came to the conclusion that by the terms of the contract the plaintiff was not entitled to recover anything. In my judgment, if a person employs an auctioneer to sell his property by auction, and in consideration of such employment, the auctioneer incurs expenses in advertising for the sale and otherwise in respect thereof, there is a contract by the employer with the auctioneer that the property shall be sold by him at an auction sale, and if the principal prohibits, or by his act prevents, the sale, the auctioneer is entitled to be indemnified in respect of the expenses incurred by him. For these reasons I direct that judgment be entered for the plaintiff for such sum as the registrar shall find to be fair and reasonable." We do not question the result of the case, but, as we have already said, we cannot think that it was necessary to find that the defendants had by their act prevented the sale. Cases relating to the claims of house agents for commission, where the disbursements are for the most part trifling, cannot usefully be consulted in an action like the present one.

A CLAIM to rescind a contract to take shares on the ground of misrepresentation was made under somewhat novel circumstances in *Byrne v. Milom, & Co., Iron Co.* (ante, p. 85). A prospectus, issued after the company had been in existence for some years, after stating the annual profits, and showing how much would be absorbed in paying interest and dividend on the debentures and preference shares, said that the remaining amount—some £43,000—was "equal to over 28 per cent. on the ordinary share capital of £150,000." The prospectus did not, however, specifically set out a clause in the articles of association by which the company was prohibited from distributing more than 10 per cent. on its ordinary shares until the whole of its debentures were

repaid. This omission, it was said, amounted to a misrepresentation or concealment of material facts which entitled the plaintiff, who had taken shares on the faith of the prospectus, to rescission. The classical dictum as to what a prospectus ought to contain is that of *KINDERSLEY, V.C.*, in *New Brunswick, & Railway Co. v. Muggerridge* (1 Dr. & Sm. 381), quoted by *Lord CHELMSFORD, L.C.*, in *Venezuela Railway Co. v. Kisch* (15 W. R. 821, L. R. 2 H. L. p. 113). Those who invite subscriptions on the faith of a prospectus "are bound to state everything with strict and scrupulous accuracy, and not only to abstain from stating as fact that which is not so, but to omit no one fact within their knowledge the existence of which might in any way affect the nature, or extent, or quality of the privileges and advantages which the prospectus holds out as inducements to take shares." But while the author of the prospectus must at his peril come up to this ideal, he is entitled, on the other hand, to require that the intending subscriber shall place a fair construction on its contents. It is possible that a person reading the above statement as to profits might jump to the conclusion that he was going to get a dividend of 28 per cent. or something like it on his money, but in fact no such statement was made, and to the accuracy of the statement that really was made no exception seems to have been taken. The balance of profits did amount to the specified percentage on the ordinary shares, but to what extent that percentage would be distributed in the way of dividend depended on the directors, acting under the guidance of the articles, and on the company in general meeting. The articles were offered for inspection, though not in London; but apart from this, the plaintiff, as *KEKEWICH, J.*, held, was not justified in assuming that the company would disburse the whole of its profits. The action, accordingly, was dismissed.

PREPAYMENT OF SUMS COVENANTED IN A MARRIAGE SETTLEMENT TO BE PAID AT A SPECIFIED TIME.

It often happens in marriage settlements that some person covenants for payment after his death of a sum of money to the trustees, to be held by them on the trusts of the settlement. In a well-drawn settlement power is given to the covenantor to pay the money in his lifetime if he thinks fit, but occasionally this power is omitted, and the question then arises, is the receipt of the trustees for the money, if paid before the death of the covenantor, a good discharge? The late Mr. CHARLES DAVIDSON expresses an unqualified opinion that the receipt by the trustees for money paid by anticipation is not a complete discharge. He says (3 Dav. Prec. 866, note): "Unless the trust provides for payment by anticipation, such a payment would not discharge the covenantor in the case either of the fund representing the money paid undergoing a depreciation, so as at the regular time of payment to be of less value than the sum covenanted to be paid, or of any breach of trust on the part of the trustee previously to the regular time of payment, up to which time the power of giving receipts would not arise in the absence of express provision for the purpose."

There is, however, a decision of *MALINS, V.C.* (*Maskelyne v. Russell, Weekly Notes*, 1869, 184), which requires consideration. In that case the father of the intended husband covenanted in his marriage settlement for payment to the trustees of two sums of £5,000 each, one to be paid during his life or immediately after his death, the other to be paid within five years of his death, with interest on each of the sums from his death until payment. Both the sums were secured on real estate belonging to the covenantor, which he contracted to sell with the intention of paying at once both the sums to the trustees. On the purchaser doubting whether he had power to pay off the second sum in his lifetime, the court held "that if the trustees could be trusted with the money after the plaintiff's death, they could just as well be trusted immediately, and declared that the covenantor was at liberty to pay both or either of the sums to the trustees during his life, and that such payment would be a good discharge."

To a person reading this report carelessly, it would appear that the decision was directly opposed to Mr. DAVIDSON's opinion.

But a
the dis
covenan
reason
case w
difficul
that, p
be paid
trusted
differen
certain
covenan
for pay
by depu
which
the rea
having
that it
which i
Most m
occasion
v. Ruck
discover
In M
from th
"secure
by a mo
redempt
the trus
sums we
Dickins
reasonin
Maskely
Sim. 30
before i
of the p
The o
the poin
views ar
ment mo
day, to s

THE dec
L.J.J.) i
consider
which h
trustee.
Is not ea
Under su
diately u
section 4
property
commenc
"proper
general
of action
definition
would see
This was
1869, and
364), dec
in the pr
action—s
formerly
is still ap
£250 dam
this as p
decision o
entitled.
lated the
property
could do
dams ges

But a more careful perusal will shew that this is not the case; the distinction being that in *Maskelyne v. Russell* the moneys covenanted to be paid were secured on real estate. The reasoning in the judgment, as reported, does not discuss the case where the money was charged on land, or deal with the difficulty raised by Mr. DAVIDSON. No sane person can doubt that, where in a marriage settlement property is covenanted to be paid or transferred at a future time to trustees, they can be trusted with the property at any time, but this is a very different question from that raised by Mr. DAVIDSON—viz., if a certain sum is covenanted to be paid at a certain time, is the covenant satisfied by a prior payment, if at the time appointed for payment the fund representing the money paid has, either by depreciation or fraud, become of less value than the money which ought then to be paid? But even if the reader considers the reasoning in the judgment, as reported, to be conclusive having regard to the facts of the case, it must be remembered that it is extremely dangerous to consider a *Weekly Notes* report, which is necessarily compiled in haste, as a binding authority. Most middle-aged practitioners can remember the trouble occasioned by a very able judge being led astray by *Furneaux v. Rucker* (*Weekly Notes*, 1879, p. 135), which was subsequently discovered to have been incorrectly reported.

In *Maskelyne v. Russell* some ambiguity in the report arises from the statement that the sums covenanted to be paid were "secured" on real estate. If this means that they were secured by a mortgage to the trustees, it is clear that, if the time for redemption had passed, the mortgagor had a right to insist on the trustees receiving the money. On the other hand, if the sums were merely charged, then according to the judgment in *Dickinson v. Dickinson* (3 Br. Ch. C. 19), Mr. DAVIDSON's reasoning is correct. Possibly the view of MALINS, V.C., in *Maskelyne v. Russell* may be supported by *Mills v. Osborne* (7 Sim. 30), where it was held that a trust legacy might be paid before it was due, as the extended time was given for the benefit of the person who had to pay, not of the beneficiaries.

The conclusion at which we arrive is that, until a decision on the point is reported, it is not safe to assume that Mr. DAVIDSON's views are incorrect, and that it is expedient, where in a settlement money is covenanted to be paid to the trustees on a future day, to authorize the payment to be made before that day.

H. W. E.

RIGHTS OF ACTION IN BANKRUPTCY.

THE decision of the Court of Appeal (COLLINS and STIRLING, L.J.J.) in *Rose v. Buckett* (50 W. R. 8) involves a question of considerable interest as to the extent to which rights of action which have accrued to a man before bankruptcy vest in his trustee. Upon the strict words of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883, it is not easy to see how any right of action can be excluded. Under section 54 the property of the bankrupt vests, immediately upon his being adjudged bankrupt, in the trustee; by section 44 "the property of the bankrupt" includes "all such property as may belong to or be vested in the bankrupt at the commencement of the bankruptcy"; and by section 168 "property" includes "things in action." It is clear that in general the phrase "things in action" includes rights of action, and since there is no distinction drawn in the definition between different classes of rights of action, it would seem that all alike pass to the trustee in bankruptcy. This was not so, however, under the bankruptcy law previous to 1869, and the case of *Ex parte Vine* (26 W. R. 582, 8 Ch. D. 364), decided on the Bankruptcy Act of that year—in which, as in the present Act, the term "property" included things in action—shews that the principle which induced the courts formerly to exclude certain actions from passing to the trustee is still applicable. In that case the bankrupt had recovered £250 damages in an action of slander, and the trustee claimed this as part of his estate, but the Court of Appeal, affirming the decision of BACON, C.J., held that the bankrupt was exclusively entitled. "If," said JAMES, L.J., "the bankrupt had accumulated the money and had invested it in some property, that property might be reached by the trustee. But the fact that he could do that does not enable the trustee to intercept the damages before they reach the bankrupt's hands, or to prevent

him, if he has got them, from spending them in the maintenance of himself and his family."

The most obvious application of this exception from the strict construction of the bankruptcy law is to the case of a tort which results in damage merely personal to the bankrupt—slander, for instance, as in the case just referred to, or seduction: *Howard v. Crowther* (8 M. & W. 801). On the other hand, where the tort primarily causes damage to the bankrupt's real or personal estate, the right of action passes to the trustee. The intermediate class of cases, where the injury is in respect of real or personal estate, or arises out of a breach of contract, but causes personal annoyance or suffering to the bankrupt, has been productive of a good deal of litigation. The case was much discussed in *Brewer v. Dew* (11 M. & W. 625) in 1843, in *Rogers v. Spence* (13 M. & W. 571, 12 Cl. & F. 700) in 1844 and 1846, and in *Beckham v. Drake* (2 H. L. C. 579) in 1849. *Brewer v. Dew* was an action of trespass brought for seizing the plaintiff's goods under a false and unfounded claim of a debt, and Lord ABINGER, C.B., suggested that, so far as the jury would give vindictive damages, beyond the actual loss in respect of the goods, the right of action would remain in the plaintiff. Consequently, a plea which denied the right of the plaintiff to recover any damages went too far and was bad. It would seem to follow that, where the result of a tort is at the same time to inflict personal injury on the bankrupt and also to inflict substantial injury on his estate, the cause of action will be divided, and in part it will remain in the bankrupt and in part will pass to his trustee. This was left doubtful, however, in the judgment of PARKE, B., in *Beckham v. Drake* (2 H. L. C., p. 629), where he was considering the case of a breach of contract which caused loss to the estate of the bankrupt, and also loss to the bankrupt personally. "Either," he said, "the right of action on the contract must be divided, and each sue, or the right of action altogether must remain in the bankrupt, or altogether be transferred to the assignees, or both must join, the contract being entire, to sue for damages . . . I should feel considerable difficulty in deciding the question."

This question as to the possibility of dividing the cause of action where it results at once in injury to the bankrupt and in independent injury to his property still remains undecided, as in the present case of *Rose v. Buckett* the Court of Appeal were guided by the special rule which places a trespass to land or goods in the actual possession of the plaintiff on the same footing as a personal injury to himself. "These rights of action," said Lord DENMAN, C.J., in *Rogers v. Spence* (13 M. & W., p. 581), "are given in respect of the immediate and present violation of the possession of the bankrupt, independently of his rights of property—they are an extension of that protection which the law throws around the person, and substantial damages may be recovered in respect of such rights, though no loss or diminution in value of property may have occurred; and even where such an incident has accompanied or followed a wrong of this description, the primary personal injury to the bankrupt, being the principal and essential cause of action, still remains in him and does not vest in the assignee, either as his property or his debts." And in *Beckham v. Drake* (*loc. cit.*, p. 613), CRESSWELL, J., in similar words, summed up the earlier cases as deciding that "rights of action for trespass to lands or goods in the actual possession of a trader do not pass to his assignees if he becomes bankrupt, because those rights of action are given in respect of the immediate and present violation of the possession of the bankrupt, independently of his rights of property, and are an extension of the protection given to his person, and the primary personal injury to the bankrupt is the principal and essential cause of action."

Rose v. Buckett (*supra*) afforded an exemplification of this principle. The action was brought for trespass and conversion of the plaintiff's goods, which had been given as security for a bill of sale, and damages were claimed for the personal annoyance thereby caused to the plaintiff. After the action was entered for trial, the plaintiff became bankrupt. He proceeded with the action until an order staying it was made on the application of the defendant on the ground that the cause of action was vested in the trustee in bankruptcy. In the Court of Appeal it was argued in support of this order that the cause of action was injury to the property,

as well as injury to the person, of the bankrupt, and that, since it could not be divided, the entire cause of action vested in the trustee. In fact, however, the injury to the goods was merely nominal, and the point as to the divisibility of the right of action was, as has been already stated, not decided. The substantial damages really claimed were separate from the damage to the goods, and the right to recover them remained in the bankrupt, both upon the test of "vindictive damages" suggested by Lord ABINGER in *Brewer v. Dew* (*supra*), and also upon the test laid down in the passages quoted above from *Rogers v. Spence* and *Beckham v. Drake*—namely, that the personal injury to the bankrupt is the principal and essential cause of action. It was held, accordingly, that the plaintiff was entitled to have the stay removed, and to proceed with the action. The point as to the possibility in a suitable case of the cause of action being divided will probably furnish an interesting discussion in some future litigation.

REVIEWS.

AMERICAN LAW.

TWO CENTURIES' GROWTH OF AMERICAN LAW, 1701-1901. By MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY OF THE YALE LAW SCHOOL. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons; London: Edward Arnold.

Why two centuries? is the first question which the reader will ask when he observes the title of this book. Three centuries would cover the whole growth, or a century and a quarter would deal with the growth under Independence. Why, then, two centuries? The answer is, that Yale College, now Yale University, was founded in 1701; and this is one of a series of Yale bicentennial publications dealing with the development of American learning in the succeeding period, edited and written by professors of that university. Interesting as this may be locally, there is obviously a danger that for the general reader the point of view may be incomplete. But the Members of the Law Faculty, at any rate, have been compelled to avoid it. It is impossible to sketch the growth of law since 1701 without a statement of the position in that year, and this involves, in effect, an account of the growth of the preceding century. In fact, the work is an extremely interesting study of the development of English law after transplantation to America, and the reflex action of this variation upon the parent stock at home. It is a great subject and for purposes of treatment is divided into eighteen heads—Constitutional Law, Real Property, Contract, Torts, Equity, Mortgages of Real Property, Wills, Municipal Corporations, Private Corporations, Pleadings in Civil Actions, Evidence, Criminal Law and Procedure, Patents, Copyrights, Trade-Marks, Admiralty, and International Law. Each of these subjects is dealt with by some one member of the faculty, and there is a general introduction by Dr. Simeon Baldwin.

The whole work appears to be excellently done, and is well worth a careful study by all interested in the history of English law. In a volume of 500 pages the subjects are necessarily treated in a terse fashion, but this is an advantage. The style varies with the writer, and this also is refreshing. For gems in the way of a condensed history of the development of principles, we could hardly wish anything better than the chapters on Constitutional Law and Mortgages of Real Property. For an elaborate marshalling in detail of a haphazard wealth of variants, we would recommend the chapter on Municipal Corporations, which also illustrates, and supports from early colonial instances, the theory that in early times the practical incorporation of a borough often proceeded from within, without either charter or statute, and may account for boroughs by prescription without the fiction of a lost charter. The chapters on Admiralty and International Law are of great and lasting interest as specially illustrating the difficulties of a federal constitution, and the conflict between the different States *inter se*, and between the central power and a State or States, and may be commended to the authorities in the Colonial Office and the Commonwealth of Australia, which, unlike the Dominion of Canada, is based upon principles similar to those of the United States of America. These chapters are perhaps those of the most general public interest; but we do not suggest that the rest are in any way inferior. On the contrary, the whole work is excellent.

COUNTY COURT PRACTICE.

THE YEARLY COUNTY COURT PRACTICE, 1902. FOUNDED ON ARCHBOLD'S COUNTY COURT PRACTICE, AND PITT-LEWIS' COUNTY COURT PRACTICE. By G. PITT-LEWIS, K.C., Sir C. ARNOLD WHITE, Chief Justice of Madras, and ARCHIBALD READ, B.A., Barrister-at-Law. THE CHAPTER ON COSTS, AND THE PRECEDENTS OF COSTS by Mr. MORTEN TURNER, Registrar of the Watford County Court. In Two VOLUMES. Butterworth & Co.; Shaw & Sons.

This work presents in a compact and convenient form the extensive

body of law which concerns the jurisdiction and the practice of the county courts, and its utility is greatly increased by the system of annual publication. The first volume contains in Book I. the text of the County Courts Act, 1888, thoroughly annotated, with the rules, and also the Debtors Act, 1869, and the Bills of Exchange Act, 1855; in Book II. the Employers' Liability Act, 1890, and the Workmen's Compensation Acts, 1897 and 1900, with notes, rules, and forms; in Book III. the Admiralty Jurisdiction Acts, 1868 and 1869, with information relating to the Admiralty jurisdiction of the county court; and in Book IV. the practice as to costs, with scales of costs and precedents. The county court forms and certain subsidiary but important statutes, including the Money-lenders Act, 1900, are placed in the appendix. Volume II. deals with a long list of statutes, such as the Agricultural Holdings Acts, 1883 and 1900, and the Companies Acts (so far as they relate to winding up), under which the county courts have special jurisdiction. The notes, which are very exhaustive, show that the editors—for the present edition Mr. Pitt-Lewis, K.C., and Mr. Archibald Read are immediately responsible—have carefully performed their task of bringing the work up to date. This is especially necessary in connection with the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897, the application of which has been so materially influenced by the recent decisions of the House of Lords. The notes on the County Courts Admiralty Jurisdiction Acts give a very full summary of the cases bearing on admiralty jurisdiction, and the section on costs is most clearly and conveniently arranged. The work should be of great service to county court practitioners. There is also a thin paper edition, in which the two volumes are bound together, and which is handier for carrying about. It has also the advantage that the edging is marked so as to facilitate immediate reference to any particular part of the work.

THE ANNUAL COUNTY COURT PRACTICE, 1902. FOUNDED ON POLLOCK AND NICOL'S AND HEYWOOD'S PRACTICES OF THE COUNTY COURTS. In Two VOLUMES. Edited by WILLIAM CECIL SMYLY, K.C., Judge of County Courts. Assisted by WILLIAM JAMES BROOKS, Barrister-at-Law. Sweet & Maxwell (Limited); Stevens & Sons (Limited).

The body of this work presents in a systematic form the practice of the county courts, and the statutes and rules which govern the practice are printed without notes in the appendix, references being at the same time given to the corresponding pages of the text. This has enabled the editor to work with a free hand in compiling his commentary on the statutes, and in successive chapters he deals, in clear and neatly-arranged sections, with the various proceedings to be taken in the county court. The practitioner can thus make sure of having the whole of the law shortly before him before he turns to the actual provisions, either statutes or rules, on which it depends. The chapter on equity actions and matters, for instance, conveniently summarizes the equity jurisdiction of the county court. The first volume includes the jurisdiction under the Bills of Exchange Act, 1855, and also under the Employers' Liability Act, 1890, and the Workmen's Compensation Acts, 1897 and 1900. Great care has been expended in securing that the readers shall have full information as to the operation of the latter Acts. Thus, in addition to referring under the proper headings to decisions on points of practice under the Acts, a note has been added of other decisions upon the construction of the Acts and rules, and the editors have also succeeded in interpolating a further note (pp. 564 to 564n) giving some fifteen cases decided since the work went to press. The second volume, which contains the practice under special Acts, is compiled upon the same lines as the first—that is, the jurisdiction under the Acts is first explained, and the text of the Acts is then given in the appendices. The Acts are grouped according as the county court has jurisdiction (limited or unlimited) concurrent with the High Court, or exclusive jurisdiction, and separate chapters are assigned to statutes of special importance, such as the Tithe Act, 1891, and the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894. The work is well executed, and forms a very convenient guide to county court practice.

MERCHANT SHIPPING.

A TREATISE OF THE LAW RELATIVE TO MERCHANT SHIPS AND SEAMEN. By CHARLES, Lord TENTERDEN, late Chief Justice of England. FOURTEENTH EDITION. By the late JAMES PERRONET ASPINALL, Q.C., BUTLER ASPINALL, K.C., and HUBERT STUART MOORE, Barrister-at-Law. Shaw & Sons; Butterworth & Co.

The preface to the first edition of Abbott's Merchant Shipping, which is reprinted in the present edition, is dated just a hundred years ago. In the interval the law has been profoundly changed both by statute and by judicial decision, and the text of the book has necessarily undergone corresponding alterations. Nevertheless a considerable part of Lord Tenterden's work is still retained.

and such passages are distinguished by being printed in leaded type and enclosed in brackets. The utility of this edition, however, must be tested more by what is new than what is old. Since the last edition the various Merchant Shipping Acts have been consolidated in the Act of 1894, and this, with the subsequent amending Acts, now contains most of the statute law on the subject. Other relevant Acts include the various Acts regulating the admiralty jurisdiction of the High Court and the county courts. All these statutes are printed in the Appendix, with frequent references to the pages of the text where particular provisions are discussed.

The text itself is, of course, full of judicial decisions which have been given since the first publication of the work. The section, for instance, dealing with mortgages (p. 41), though it still retains the author's statement that the mortgagee is not to be deemed the owner—now contained in section 34 of the Act of 1894—is otherwise entirely recast, the law of mortgages of ships being now largely dependent upon the statutory provisions for registration. In addition, the rights of mortgagees have been ascertained by a series of important decisions, such as *Keith v. Burrows* (2 C. P. D. 163), which are fully referred to in the notes. To the reference to *Collins v. Lamport* (13 W. R. 283) it will now be necessary to add *The Heather Bell* (49 W. R. 577), in which the Court of Appeal recently upheld the doctrine that a mortgagor can make a valid charter of the ship provided the mortgagee's security is not impaired. To this case the editors do not seem to have been able to refer. An analogous part of the book is that which deals with maritime lien, and here again the law depends on decisions of comparatively recent date, to which the text furnishes a full and reliable guide. The interesting decision of *Barnes, J.*, in *The Veritas* (50 W. R. 30), on the priority of liens, is noticed in the *addenda*. The volume has been edited with great care, and it will worthily uphold the reputation of this standard work on merchant shipping.

THE LAW OF PROPERTY.

A GENERAL VIEW OF THE LAW OF PROPERTY. By J. ANDREW STRAHAN, M.A., LL.B., Barrister-at-Law, assisted by J. SINCLAIR BAXTER, B.A., LL.B., Barrister-at-Law. THIRD EDITION. Stevens & Sons (Limited).

The appearance of a third edition of this work shews that it is becoming well established as an introduction to the law of property. Its distinctive feature is that it treats of real and personal property side by side, and makes the attempt to introduce the student to the law of property as a whole. There are advantages in the method, and in Mr. Strahan's hands there seems to be little danger of its leading to confusion. The present edition has been expanded somewhat by the introduction of further historical matter—a departure from its original analytical lines dictated doubtless by the requirements of students—and recent cases have been noted up. Thus *Nice v. Noakes* (1900, 2 Ch. 445) has been added in the chapter on mortgages, and *Re McCallum* (1901, 1 Ch. 143) in the section on the Real Property Limitation Acts. Mr. Strahan writes with accuracy and clearness, and his work deserves its popularity.

LIBEL AND SLANDER.

PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE OF THE LAW OF LIBEL AND SLANDER, WITH SUGGESTIONS ON THE CONDUCT OF A CIVIL ACTION, FORMS AND PRECEDENTS, AND ALL STATUTES BEARING ON THE SUBJECT. By HUGH FRASER, LL.D., Barrister-at-Law. THIRD EDITION. Butterworth & Co.

Mr. Fraser has the art of packing a great deal of law into a small compass, and the law of libel and slander is at once fully and concisely stated in this handy volume, which has now reached a third edition. Libel and slander furnish a goodly proportion of the actions which come before the courts, and recent years have produced several decisions of considerable importance—*Ratcliffe v. Evans* (1892, 2 Q. B. 524), for instance, on the evidence of general loss of trade which will be admitted to prove special damage in slander, and *Bonnard v. Perryman* (1891, 2 Ch. 269) on the jurisdiction to restrain a libel by interlocutory injunction. Mr. Fraser adopts the convenient plan of giving the law in a series of propositions, and accompanying them with explanatory notes. The extensive case law on the subject has been neatly incorporated, and for practical purposes the utility of the book has been greatly increased by the appendices, one on the conduct of a civil action—beginning with the sound advice, "It is always wise not to issue a writ for libel or slander in a hurry"—another containing forms of pleading, and a third including the statute law. Altogether the book is very well executed.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

The English Reports. Vol. XIV: Privy Council III., containing Moore P. C., vols. 8 to 12. William Green & Sons, Edinburgh; Stevens & Sons (Limited). Price 30s. net.

The Law Quarterly Review. Edited by Sir FREDERICK POLLOCK, Bart., D.C.L., LL.D.. January, 1902. Stevens & Sons (Limited).

CORRESPONDENCE.

HOW NOT TO INCREASE THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE LAW SOCIETY.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—I believe the members of the Council of the Law Society are anxious to increase the membership of the society. Having just been admitted and desiring to become a member of the society, as I thought it my duty to be, I wrote to the secretary for particulars as to membership. In reply, I received simply a nomination paper without any note or other form of information whatever. I am not too fastidious, but this seems to me to be neither tactful or polite. There is a large, well-paid, staff of clerks, and if men are to be brought into the society there should surely be some alteration in their methods if my experience is common.

LL.B. (Lond.).

Jan. 13.

NEW ORDERS, &c.

SUPREME COURT FUNDS RULE 17a.

I, the Right Honourable Hardinge Stanley, Earl of Halsbury, Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain, with the concurrence of the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury, do hereby, in pursuance of the powers contained in the Court of Chancery Funds Act, 1872, the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1875, the Supreme Court of Judicature (Funds, &c.) Act, 1883, the Supreme Court of Judicature (Procedure) Act, 1894, and every other power enabling me in that behalf, make the following Rule:—

After Rule 17 of the Supreme Court Funds Rules, 1894, the following Rule shall be added:—

17a. Unless the court shall otherwise direct, or a certificate is produced from the Commissioners of Inland Revenue that no claim on the fund in court is made by them in respect of such income tax, the paymaster shall transfer the amount of the income tax which has been so deducted, to the proper account of the said commissioners at the bank, under the provisions of Rule 52.

This rule shall come into operation on the eleventh day of January 1902, and may be cited as the Supreme Court Funds Rule 1902, 17a.

The 27th of December, 1901.

(Signed) HALSBURY, C.

COLONIAL STOCK ACT, 1900. (63 & 64 Vict. c. 62.)

FURTHER LIST OF STOCKS UNDER SECTION 2.

Pursuant to section 2 of the "Colonial Stock Act, 1900," the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury hereby give notice that the provisions of the Act have been complied with in respect of the undermentioned Stocks, registered or inscribed in the United Kingdom:—

Ceylon.

4 per cent. Inscribed Stock (1934).

3 per cent. Inscribed Stock (1940).

The restrictions mentioned in section 2, sub-section (2) of "The Trustee Act, 1893," apply to the above Stocks (see "Colonial Stock Act, 1900," section 2).

Treasury Chambers, January, 1902.

At a meeting of judges of the King's Bench Division on Saturday last their lordships chose the following circuits for the summer assizes—viz., Northern circuit, the Lord Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Wills; north-eastern circuit, Mr. Justice Griffiths and Mr. Justice Bruce; Midland circuit, Mr. Justice Lawrance and Mr. Justice Channell; Oxford circuit, Mr. Justice Wright and Mr. Justice Walton; western circuit, Mr. Justice Bigham and Mr. Justice Bucknill; south-eastern circuit, Mr. Justice Kennedy and Mr. Justice Phillimore; North Wales circuit, Mr. Justice Jelf; South Wal circuit, Mr. Justice Ridley. Mr. Justice Darling will remain in town.

Mr. Justice Jelf was entertained at a congratulatory dinner at the Café Royal on Wednesday evening by the members of the Oxford Circuit, in celebration of his recent elevation to the bench. Mr. H. D. Greene, K.C., M.P., presided, and a very large number of both past and present members of the circuit assembled in honour of the learned judge, among them being Mr. Justice Darling and the Common Serjeant (Mr. Bosanquet, K.C.). Letters of regret at being unavoidably absent from the dinner were read during the evening from Viscount Llandaff, Lord James of Hereford, Lord Rowton, Sir Robert Reid, K.C., M.P., Sir Richard Harington, Judge Elliott, Judge Ingham, and Mr. Hayes Fisher, M.P.

CASES OF THE WEEK.

Court of Appeal.

POISSON v. ROBERTSON. No. 2. 14th Jan.

SECRET REMEDY—RECIPE—JOINT OWNERS—RIGHT OF ONE JOINT OWNER TO INSPECTION OF SECRET RECIPE.

This was an appeal from a decision of Joyce, J., refusing to make an order for inspection. The motion was by the plaintiff in the action that he might be at liberty to inspect and take copies of the original recipe for the manufacture of the secret specific or remedy known as "Tacquaru" then in the possession of the defendant Turvey. Upon the hearing of the action in July last Kekowich, J., held that an agreement dated in March, 1896, and made between one Edwards, the former owner of "Tacquaru," and the defendant Robertson, amounted to an agreement of partnership between them. Robertson was to act as managing partner and was entitled to one-half of the profits. By a number of subsequent assignments the property became vested as to two-eighths in the plaintiff Woods (who by the terms of his assignment was admitted to have no right to inspect the recipe), as to three-eighths in the plaintiff Poisson, and as to three-eighths in the defendant Turvey. But his lordship held that no partnership existed between the plaintiff Poisson and the defendant Turvey and that consequently Poisson was not entitled to an account in respect of the business carried on by Turvey in the manufacture and sale of the remedy. Both Poisson and Turvey were entitled to make and sell the remedy for his own profit, but his lordship gave no decision upon the plaintiff's claim in the action that he was entitled to inspect and take a copy of the recipe. Liberty was given to apply. Both the plaintiff Poisson and the defendant Turvey derived their interests under the defendant Robertson. The assignment to Poisson was first in date, but he did not obtain a copy, or any knowledge of the secret recipe. Upon the assignment to Turvey, Robertson handed over to him the original piece of paper upon which the recipe was written; but it was in evidence that, the paper having become much worn by use, Turvey had destroyed the original after he had taken a copy. The motion in the action was brought on under the liberty to apply. Joyce, J., refused to make an order on Turvey to shew the paper, but without prejudice to any subsequent application. The plaintiff appealed.

THE COURT (VAUGHAN WILLIAMS, STIRLING, and COZENS-HARDY, L.J.J.) dismissed the appeal. They thought that, as matters stood, the action had come to an end. The questions in the action had been adjudicated upon and there was no consequential relief. The fact that liberty to apply had been reserved did not carry the matter any further. The addition of the words "liberty to apply" did not entitle the plaintiff to make an application as to matters which did not arise in working out the judgment. Rule 14 of order 31 did not apply to the present case, which was not a "pending cause or matter" within the meaning of that rule. The objection of the defendant must therefore prevail and the appeal must be dismissed. Their lordships, however, were not prepared to say that the plaintiff was not entitled to relief in another action.—COUNSEL, Hughes, K.C., and Harman; Wright Taylor. SOLICITORS, J. A. Maxwell; Maurice Mosley.

(Reported by S. E. WILLIAMS, Barrister-at-Law.)

WHITE v. HARROW. No. 2. 14th Jan.

LEASE—LIGHT—COVENANT NOT TO OBJECT TO ADJOINING BUILDINGS—ADJOINING.

This was an appeal from the decision of Joyce, J. (reported ante, p. 105). By a lease, dated the 20th of September, 1894, certain premises were let by the trustees of the Portland estates to the plaintiff White. The lease contained a covenant "that the lessee, his executors, administrators, and assigns, would not object to any works to adjoining premises that might be sanctioned by or on behalf of the said trustees or trustee or other the person or persons for the time being entitled in reversion to the said estates, and would not claim any easement against the said person or persons entitled as aforesaid in, over, or upon any adjoining or neighbouring premises belonging to the said person or persons by reason of any act or thing done or suffered by any tenant of such adjoining or neighbouring premises, and that notwithstanding any actual or constructive notice of such act or thing to the said person or persons." By a lease, dated the 3rd of August, 1899, the plaintiff sublet the said premises to the defendant Harrow, and included in the lease the covenant set out above. The Marylebone District Property Co. acquired from the trustees a lease of certain property abutting upon the premises let as above stated to the defendant Harrow, and proposed to erect thereon certain buildings which the defendant alleged would prove an obstruction to his lights. He thereupon commenced the action of Harrow v. Marylebone District Property Co. to assert his rights. The plaintiff White was not a party to that action, but was a director of the Marylebone Co., and commenced the action of White v. Harrow to obtain an injunction to restrain the defendant Harrow from objecting to the buildings then being erected by the Marylebone Co., and from claiming any easement of light over the proposed buildings. The plans of the proposed building had been sanctioned by the trustees. It was admitted for the purposes of the motion that the proposed building would interfere with the defendant's lights. Joyce, J., held that the plaintiff was entitled to have the proceedings in Harrow v. Marylebone District Property Co. stayed. The defendant appealed.

THE COURT (VAUGHAN WILLIAMS, STIRLING, and COZENS-HARDY, L.J.J.) allowed the appeal.

VAUGHAN WILLIAMS, L.J., said: This case turns upon the construction of covenants in a lease. It is said that the construction is such as to pre-

clude the lessee from objecting to the erection of certain buildings which would obstruct certain lights in the demised premises. It is said that the words "adjoining premises" extend not only to buildings which come into physical contact with the demised building, but also to any buildings which are situated near enough to affect materially the demised premises by obstructing easements. I cannot agree to this construction. I think that "adjoining" means adjoining in the sense in which it is used in the London Building Act, 1894. "Adjoining" cannot be used in the sense of "neighbouring," but is used in the sense of "in physical contact with." It is said that this construction makes the covenant of no practical effect, but it would plainly have the effect of relieving the lessor from obtaining the consent of the lessee to works proposed to be done to adjoining premises according to the provisions of the London Building Act. It was said that the intention of the covenant was to prevent the lessee objecting to the obstruction of an easement by the erection of buildings by the lessor, but if this were the intention it would have been easy to say so in plain terms. In my judgment we ought not to construe a covenant as giving a lessor the power to derogate from his own grant if the words are fairly capable of another construction.—COUNSEL, Younger, K.C., and Edward Ford; Hughes, K.C., and Wain. SOLICITORS, Cooper & Bake; Samuel Lithgow.

(Reported by S. E. WILLIAMS, Barrister-at-Law.)

High Court—Chancery Division.

DEAN AND CHAPTER OF CHESTER AND OTHERS v. SMELTING CORPORATION. Farwell, J. 14th Jan.

PRACTICE—MOTION—EVIDENCE—R. S. C. LII. 4.

A question arose, upon a motion to commit, as to the admissibility of certain evidence not comprised in the affidavits upon which the motion was originally founded before it was ordered to be heard with witnesses. The plaintiffs, who were the owners and tenants respectively of certain farm lands, had brought an action against the defendants, who were a company working a process for smelting lead, zinc, and silver, for an injunction restraining them from causing injury or nuisance by smoke and noxious fumes. On the 2nd of August, 1901, an injunction was granted. In September, 1901, after making certain alterations, the liquidator of the defendant company recommenced work, the results of which were alleged by the plaintiffs to be substantially as bad as ever. On the 5th of November, 1901, the plaintiffs accordingly served a notice of motion to commit the defendants to prison for contempt by breach of the injunction, together with affidavits in support. On the 22nd of November the matter came before the court, and was ordered to be heard with witnesses on a day fixed. The motion accordingly now came on, and the plaintiffs sought to give evidence of experiments, not included in the affidavits filed, and of damage done to the stock of a neighbouring farm, of which particulars had not been given. For the defendants it was objected that on the true construction of R. S. C. ord. 52, r. 4, such new evidence was now inadmissible: Taylor v. Roe (68 L. T. 213).

FARWELL, J.—I think the objection is not well founded. I think that the rule has no application to a case where a motion to attach for contempt has been launched and, either by consent of the parties or on application to the court, has been ordered to be heard with witnesses. The affidavits are then no longer used, and there is no object in using them. The rule does not apply to a motion founded on evidence other than by affidavit, as I decided in a case last year where, on a motion to enforce an award, there was a cross-motion to set it aside, on which only *new* evidence was tendered. I admitted that evidence, and I give the same decision here. The reason is that where there would probably be a mere waste of time, money, and labour resulting in a conflict of evidence, so that it becomes necessary to have oral evidence, there is no object in having the affidavits. The first part of ord. 52, r. 4, prescribes that the notice of motion shall state the grounds "in general terms"; if the respondent wants to have particulars he can apply for them; here he did apply to some extent and obtained some particulars. But he did not apply for further particulars, and I do not see that he is in any way hurt by this evidence being admitted. I therefore admit it.—COUNSEL, C. E. E. Jenkins, K.C., and O. Leigh Clare; Bramwell-Davies, K.C., and G. Laurens. SOLICITORS, Tatham & Proctor, for Barker & Rogers; Cheater; Druce & Atlee.

(Reported by W. H. DRAPER, Barrister-at-Law.)

High Court—King's Bench Division.

THE URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL OF ESHER AND THE DITTONS v. MARKS. Walton, J. 31st Oct., 1st Nov., and 11th Jan.

HIGHWAY—NEW ROAD IN PLACE OF OLD—LIABILITY TO REPAIR "RATIONS TENURAE"—LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT, 1891, s. 25 (2).

Action to recover £137 for necessary expenses incurred by the plaintiff district council in and about the repair of a highway known as Ember-lane within their district, which highway they alleged the defendant was liable to repair *rations tenuræ*. The action was brought under section 25 (2) of the Local Government Act, 1891, which provides that where a highway repairable *rations tenuræ* is reported out of repair and the person liable fails when requested by the district council to place it in proper repair, the district council may do the work and charge the person liable with the expenses thus incurred. The history of the road in question was shortly this: In 1773 Mr. George Onslow, the owner of the Ember Court estate, which

was a manor of the parish of Thames Ditton, obtained the licence of the king to close up an old highway for carts, carriages, and foot passengers which passed through his property, and ran from Thames Ditton and Esher to East and West Molesey. Mr. Onslow made a new road in substitution for the old one, and undertook that it should be kept in good and sufficient repair by himself, his heirs and assigns. It was not disputed that Ember-lane, as originally laid out, was the road which Mr. Onslow was required to provide in the place of the old highway which he had stopped up and inclosed, and there was no evidence that it had ever been repaired by the inhabitants or any public body. In April, 1900, the surveyor of the district council found that the road was in a bad state of repair, and the defendant, who was the owner of a part of the original Ember Court estate, was called upon to repair it. The defendant denied liability, and the council executed the work and brought the present action to recover the amount they had expended. It was contended for the defendant that liability to repair a highway *ratione tenuræ* could exist by prescription only, and that, as Ember-lane did not exist before 1773, the defendant could not be liable to repair it *ratione tenuræ*. It was also argued that the case was similar to *Reg. v. Barker* (25 Q. B. D. 213) and that the old road set out as a highway in 1774 had disappeared; that its character had been so completely changed that it had, long before any question arose between the plaintiffs and the defendant, ceased to be the road which Mr. Onslow, his heirs and assigns, were required to repair, and had become something entirely different. At the conclusion of the arguments, during which *Leigh Urban Council v. King* (1901, 1 Q. B. 747), *Gwyn v. Hardwicke* (25 L. J. M. O. 97), *Reg. v. Burney* (31 L. T. 828), *Mayor of Lyme Regis v. Henley* (1 Bing. N. O. 212), *Stratford Bridge case* (2 M. & S. 520n), and *Reg. v. Duchess of Buccleugh* (1 Salk. 358) were cited, judgment was reserved.

WALTON, J., held that the road in question was made in substitution for the old one, and was repairable by the defendant *ratione tenuræ*. Judgment was accordingly entered for the plaintiffs for the amount claimed, with costs.—COUNSELL, Macmorran, K.C., and Manisty, K.C.; Robson, K.C., and G. F. Hart. SOLICITORS, G. M. Baker; M. Abrahams, Sons, & Co.

[Reported by ERKIN REID, Barrister-at-Law.]

LAW SOCIETIES.

INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

A special general meeting of the members of the society will be held in the hall of the society on Friday, the 31st of January, at two o'clock precisely, to consider the subjects hereinafter mentioned.

Mr. Charles Ford will move: "That, in the opinion of this meeting, the Council has misconceived the desire of the general body of members of the society as regards the club, which is that, in substitution thereof, facilities should be given to all members of the society to obtain light refreshments on the society's premises at moderate charges, but without any additional annual subscription."

Mr. Charles Ford will ask: "What number of town members, and what number of country members, have assented to the Council's scheme in the place of the former club arrangements?"

E. W. WILLIAMSON, Secretary.

UNITED LAW SOCIETY.

Jan 13.—Mr. E. F. Spence being in the chair.—Mr. Percy Aylen mov. d: "That except in so far as it is based upon the 'Dickie incident,' the decision in *Quinn v. Leatham* (L. R. App. Cas., Nov., 1901, 495; L. T., vol. 85, p. 289) is wrong." Mr. A. W. Marks opposed. There also spoke: Messrs. H. Drysdale Woodcock, P. B. Morley, J. Wylie, and P. B. Walmsley. Mr. Aylen replied. The motion was lost by one vote.

MR. JUSTICE WALTON ON LORD RUSSELL OF KILLOWEN.

MR. JUSTICE WALTON delivered an address before the Liverpool Board of Legal Studies on Thursday evening in last week, on the subject of "The late Lord Russell of Killowen." Principal Dale, M.A., vice-chairman of the board, presided, and there was a large attendance. Mr. Justice Walton said that when he was asked to address the law students of Liverpool, it occurred to him that he might say something of one whom he liked to think of, and was proud to remember as his old master—Lord Russell of Killowen. He became a pupil in Lord Russell's chambers at No. 3, Brick-court, Temple, about the year 1867, and he hoped he might venture to say that he remained his disciple to the end, never working for him, or with him, or before him when he became Chief Justice, without feeling a fresh inspiration and a new lesson from his great example. He did not think any student could be long in the chambers of Mr. Charles Russell without beginning to appreciate that to work for Russell was in itself an education. What were the lessons that they, the pupils at Brick-court, learned from their service under that master, who afterwards rose to the foremost place at the bar, and to the office of Lord Chief Justice? In the first place, Russell made his pupils, and, indeed, everyone who worked for him, feel that their work was not a mere exercise, but was real responsible work; that they were working, not merely for him as pupils, but for the case and the client. It was a remarkable characteristic of Russell throughout his life that he always welcomed, and was greedy of, assistance. He acknowledged it openly and generously, and he paid the best possible compliments to those who worked for him by adopting and using, so far as he could, often without

alteration, the result of their labours. Thus his pupils learned to work with a certain sense of responsibility as to his method of work. He used to tell them to first master the facts. He loved a note neatly written, with a large margin and plenty of space between the lines, setting out the facts in chronological order. Then there was the necessary consideration of text-books and authorities. Here he expected diligence and thoroughness, but his method, as usual, was of the simplest. So much for work in chambers. But Russell was always glad to have the assistance of a pupil in court, especially of a pupil who was already called to the bar. He liked to have a continuous note taken for him, so that he might be free to give his whole concentrated attention to all that was going on in the case. It was indeed a fine discipline to take a note for Russell. He expected at least an imitation of his wonderful power of attention and concentration. He (Mr. Justice Walton) could honestly say that he could not remember receiving on any of the many occasions on which he worked for Charles Russell any reproach expressed in language which could be called violent—but when, as he must admit sometimes happened, he was caught inattentive, the way in which Russell would say, "Oh! I thought you were taking a note?" or "Oh! I see you have something else to do!" was quite enough to make one feel very small and very repentant. There was nothing so characteristic of the man as the directness and simplicity of his mind and character, and of his methods of thought and action. There was never any thought of personal display in his work—no trace of vanity, never any assumption of superiority in the way of learning, or knowledge or cleverness of any kind. In conducting a case, in cross-examining a witness, his tactics were of the simplest kind. He (Mr. Justice Walton) felt satisfied that he was right in saying that Russell never acted a part, he never descended to the tricks and artifices of advocacy. He played the game with the cards on the table. So far, therefore, as his methods of work were concerned, admirable and excellent as they were, there was nothing in them which they, might not all of them, hope to imitate, and to imitate with success. And yet, as exercised by him, what a marvellous, what an unparalleled effect they produced. What, then, was the final lesson? The methods of Lord Russell in his work, simple and direct as they were, contributed to, and were, indeed, essential to the success which he had attained. There were within the reach of them all. His force and his power were peculiar to himself, but even the humblest student might by industry and practice acquire something of his habit of close and continuous attention and concentration. And so, continued the speaker, we may all learn something from the example of this great man, whose face and voice were once so familiar in this city, where his singular gifts found their first appreciation, and which was the scene of his earliest success. In conclusion, would they allow him to say a word, which he was glad to have this opportunity of saying in Liverpool. He was afraid that Lord Russell was often misunderstood in Liverpool, and sometimes perhaps made enemies. It is true that he had an imperious character and a quick temper. In the vehemence and strain of his nature, when immersed in the struggles of his work, he sometimes said things in a moment of impatience which no one regretted afterwards more than he did himself. But outbursts of this kind were very superficial. They were like the spray thrown off by a great wave as it met with some obstacle in its onward movement. There never was a kinder man; there never was a truer or more generous friend.

Professor Emmott proposed a vote of thanks to Mr. Justice Walton, and said they regarded him with honour and respect as being one who, amidst a career of unexampled success, had preserved the very best traditions of the profession.

Mr. Bateson seconded, and it was passed unanimously.

LEGAL NEWS.

OBITUARY.

MR. WILLIAM BENJAMIN PATERSON, the senior partner in the well-known firm of Patersons, Snow, Bloxam, & Kinder, of 25, Lincoln's-inn-fields, W.C., died at his residence, No. 1, Craven Hill-gardens, W., on Thursday, the 2nd instant, and was buried on Monday, the 6th instant, in the churchyard of St. Nicholas, Chislehurst, Kent. Mr. Paterson, who was born on the 9th of May, 1818, was the eldest son of Mr. William Sanders Paterson, of Wimbledon, Surrey, and Louisa, daughter of Mr. John Bridge, of Winford Eagle, Dorsetshire. He served his articles with Mr. Thomas Mortimer Cleobury, of 12, Montague-street, Russell-square, and was admitted a solicitor in Trinity term, 1841. His name, therefore, had been on the roll for more than sixty years. In the year 1864, Mr. Paterson, upon the appointment of Mr. John William Hawkins as one of the chief clerks of the then Master of the Rolls, Lord Romilly, joined the firm of Hawkins, Bloxam, & Hawkins, of 2, New Boswell-court, Lincoln's-inn, which then became Hawkins, Bloxam, Paterson, & Power, one of his partners being the late Mr. Edward Bloxam. In May, 1867, Mr. Edward Bloxam was appointed a chief clerk to Vice-Chancellor Wood, and Mr. John Hawkins (the father of Mr. John William Hawkins) having died, Mr. Paterson became the head of the firm, a position which he occupied until the time of his death. Mr. Paterson was elected a member of the Council of the Incorporated Law Society in the year 1870, but retired in 1882. He was a member of the Solicitors' Benevolent Association, and of the Law Association for the benefit of the widows and families of solicitors in the metropolis and vicinity. By his wife Mary, the daughter of the late Mr. Samuel Golding, of Walsham-le-Willows, Suffolk, who predeceased him, he had five children, of whom three survive, a son, Mr. William Vautier Paterson, who has since June, 1890, been a member of his father's firm, and two daughters. Mr. Paterson was a man of

indefatigable industry, and until a few months before his death was engaged in the active exercise of his profession. His sound and deliberate judgment, his high sense of honour, and his kindly and genial manners won for him the esteem and regard of a large circle of clients and friends.

Mr. C. O. HUMPHREYS, solicitor, of Glitspur-chambers, Holborn-viaduct, died on Friday in last week. He was the son of the late Mr. William Corne Humphreys, and after receiving his education at the London University, was articled to his father, and was admitted in 1849. He was the legal representative of many important trade societies, including the West End Drapers' Society, and conducted several criminal prosecutions on behalf of the London and North-Western and the Great Northern Railway Companies, and the London and St. Katherine Docks Co. He was a Past Master of the Saddlers' Company, to which guild he acted for many years as clerk and solicitor. He was also prosecuting solicitor to the Incorporated Law Society, and prosecuting solicitor to the Gas Light and Coke Co., and was for thirty years solicitor to the Fishmongers' Company of London, and was for some time chairman of the Law and Parliamentary Committee of the Corporation of London. He was a brother-in-law of Lord Halsbury, whose first wife was his sister. His youngest son, Mr. Travers Humphreys, is a member of the bar. He was buried at Teddington Cemetery, the burial being preceded by a memorial service at All Saints' Church, Norfolk-square. Among the chief mourners were Colonel MacNeill (brother-in-law) and Mr. J. P. Grain; while among others present were Mr. E. W. Williamson, the secretary of the Incorporated Law Society; Mr. J. Wrench Towse, the clerk to the Fishmongers' Company; Mr. Sherwell, the clerk to the Saddlers' Company; and the members of the office staff. Owing to the sitting of the Court of Claims, the Lord Chancellor was unable to attend the funeral. A wreath was sent from the detective department of the City Police, and a number of detective officers attended as a deputation.

The death is announced of Mr. EDWARD STRICK, LL.B., solicitor, of Swansea, the head of the firm of Strick, Bellingham, and Hanson, in his 86th year. Mr. Strick, who was admitted in 1839, was for about 38 years coroner for the Borough of Swansea and the Seignories of Gower and Kilvey. Mr. Strick, although not of the length of standing of Mr. Oehme, of Upper Norwood, who was admitted in 1831, must have been one of the oldest practising country solicitors.

APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. JOHN PAGE MIDDLETON, barrister-at-law, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Cyprus, has been appointed a Puisne Justice of the Supreme Court of the Island of Ceylon.

Mr. BASIL SCOTT, barrister-at-law, has been appointed Advocate-General for the Presidency of Bombay, in succession to Mr. Basil Lang, retired.

CHANGES IN PARTNERSHIPS.

ADMISSIONS.

Messrs. Linklater, Addison, Brown, & Jones, solicitors, of 2, Bond-court, Walbrook, E.C., have admitted into partnership Mr. H. LACEY ADDISON, the son of Mr. Joseph Addison, and Mr. HAROLD GEORGE BROWN, B.A., LL.B., the son of Mr. Harold Brown.

GENERAL.

At the Clerkenwell County Court on Saturday last, says the *St. James's Gazette*, a solicitor asked if he was compelled to accept four Scotch notes in payment of a court debt. The judge said the notes would not be legal tender in this country, and that if a bank charged commission on them the costs of the application would be allowed.

The list of House of Lord appeals for the forthcoming sittings consists of twenty-six cases, of which twenty are English, one is Irish, and five are Scotch appeals. There are also three claims depending—viz., to the Earldom of Norfolk, to the Baronies of Darcy de Knayth, Meynill and Fauconberg, and to the office of Lord Great Chamberlain of England.

A singular deed has, says the *Canadian Law Review*, been filed in Northumberland County, Pa. It is dated on the 9th of October, 1793. In a series of recitals it traces the ownership of the land conveyed from the Creator of the earth, who, "by parol and livery of seisin did enfeof the parents of mankind, to wit, Adam and Eve, of all that certain tract of land called and known in the planetary system as the earth."

The present business of the Liverpool Court of Passage was brought to a conclusion, says the *St. James's Gazette*, on Thursday in last week, when Judge Baylis said that there was some misunderstanding as to his position. It was assumed that he was about to retire. At his age (eighty-five) he was not very much concerned for the reform of procedure, but as long as he retained his position he should do his duty loyally to the Crown and to the Corporation of Liverpool.

Chief Justice Falconbridge, in opening the recent criminal assizes at Toronto, was, says the *Canadian Law Review*, clad in the costume of chief justice as worn in Canadian courts of Oyer and Terminer previous to the year 1877, since which date the more sombre but less impressive black gown of King's Counsel has been worn in all Canadian courts. The costume worn by Chief Justice Falconbridge consisted of a purple and drab mantle with a deep hood of similar colour draping over the left shoulder. The mantle was gathered at the waist with a broad band of black material.

The resignation of Mr. Archibald Milman as Clerk of the House of Commons will, says the *Westminster Gazette*, remove a noteworthy figure from the Lower House. Mr. Milman is a man who has enjoyed the high

esteem of members on both sides of the House. In 1858 he entered the service of the House, and in 1870, during the Speakership of Mr. Denison, afterwards Viscount Ossington, he was made second clerk assistant. Mr. Milman had as colleagues two of the greatest authorities on Parliamentary practice that ever sat at the table—Sir Erskine May and Sir Reginald Palgrave. Mr. Milman succeeded to the clerkship on the retirement of Sir Reginald, nearly two years ago. "Endowed with acute mental capacity," remarks the *Daily Telegraph*, "Mr. Milman not only utilized his gifts of insight and intelligence with unwearied industry, but devoted his powers of work to the interests of the House of Commons. Curiously enough, his tenure of office coincided with the first, the fiercest, and the most continuous outbreak of Parliamentary obstruction ever witnessed, and his colleagues testify that he met the situation with ability and an energy greater than most people had credited him with possessing."

A report has been prepared by the committee appointed by the Faculty of Advocates in Scotland to consider the system under which appointments to the rank of K.C. are at present made. The committee state that the benefits flowing from the introduction of the rank of K.C. might or might not have come up to the anticipation of its promoters, but the system has certainly shewn itself open to objections. What the faculty really had in view was merely a new method of determining precedence amongst its members. Under the older system a man was master of his own career. When he had reached a stage at which it was natural to think of giving up junior practice, all he had to do was to let it be known that he had stopped writing. Under the new system it is entirely different. The rank of K.C. gives such prestige to its possessor in the vulgar estimation that the man who does not possess it cannot compete in senior work with those who do. Twenty-one members of the faculty have applied for the rank, and the applications of fourteen of these have been granted. In the list of those judged unworthy of the rank, and therefore practically debarred from senior practice, it is curious to find no fewer than six gentlemen whom the Crown has appointed to be sheriffs in important counties, and whose position in the eyes of the practitioners in their local courts must therefore be an anomalous one. A fundamental defect is to be found in the present system. The faculty desired an improved method of determining the precedence of its members. The committee, after pointing out several practical objections, recommended that the dean be instructed to wait upon the Lord Justice General and submit to him the views of the faculty.

COURT PAPERS.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

Date.	EMERGENCY ROTA.	APPEAL COURT No. 2.	Mr. Justice KEKEWICH.	Mr. Justice BYRN.
Monday, Jan. 20	Mr. Godfrey	Mr. R. Leach	Mr. King	Mr. Farmer
Tuesday 21	Carrington	Beal	Church	Godfrey
Wednesday 22	Pugh	R. Leach	King	Farmer
Thursday 23	Beal	Beal	Church	Godfrey
Friday 24	Beal	R. Leach	King	Farmer
Saturday 25	Farmer	Beal	Church	Godfrey

Date.	Mr. Justice FARWELL.	Mr. Justice BUCKLEY.	Mr. Justice JOYCE.	Mr. Justice SWINFEN EADY.
Monday, Jan. 20	Mr. Jackson	Mr. Carrington	Mr. W. Leach	Mr. Church
Tuesday 21	Pemberton	Pugh	Greswell	King
Wednesday 22	Jackson	Carrington	W. Leach	Greswell
Thursday 23	Pemberton	Pugh	Greswell	W. Leach
Friday 24	Jackson	Carrington	W. Leach	Pemberton
Saturday 25	Pemberton	Pugh	Greswell	Jackson

COURT OF APPEAL.

HILARY SITTINGS, 1902.

(Continued from p. 181.)

FROM THE CHANCERY DIVISION, THE PROBATE, DIVORCE AND ADMIRALTY DIVISION (PROBATE AND DIVORCE), AND THE COUNTY PALATINE AND STANNARIES COURTS.

(General List.)

1900.

In re Pitt-Rivers Scott v Pitt-Rivers appl of deft A E L F Pitt-Rivers from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Jan 28, 1901 March 20
Bunge v Higinbotham & Co ld appl of plff from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Feb 23, 1901 March 26
In re Morse Morse v Morse appl of deft, other than E Alcock, from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated Feb 22, 1901, and cross notice of the plff from same order (dated March 23, 1901) March 28
Comms of the Harbour of Poole v Pike appl of plffs from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Feb 8, 1901 March 28
Pelly v East London Water Works Co appl of deft Henry Base from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated March 13, 1901 March 29
Same appl of defts Tae East London Water Works from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated March 13, 1901 March 29
Leeds Forge Co ld v Deighton's Patent Flue & Tube Co ld appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Cozens-Hardy, dated March 29, 1901 April 1
The Picture Post Card Co ld v Ross appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated March 20, 1901 April 2
J & J Cash ld v Cash appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Feb 2, 1901 April 2
In re The Companies Acts, 1862 to 1893 & In re The Brighton Hotels ld appl of Septimus Parsonage (the petr) from order of Mr Justice Wright, dated March 20, 1901 (produce order) April 3

Davey v Lachenal appl of plttf from order of Mr Justice Byrne, dated Jan 25, 1901 April 4

In re Thomas S. Quinn and The Temperance Permanent Building Soc and the Matter of the Trustee Act, 1893 appl of plttf O Woolldroft from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated March 1, 1901 April 10

In re Dunn Dunn v Skardon appl of plttf from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Jan 31, 1901 April 15

Oliver v Bank of England (Starkey, Leveson, & Cooke, third parties) appl of W J Starkey from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated March 25, 1901 April 26

In re Mexborough Savile v Mexborough appl of plttf from order of Mr Justice Farwell, dated April 2, 1901 April 26

In re H Holland, junr Gregg v Holland appl of defts The New Industrial Contract Syndicate, ld, from order of Mr Justice Farwell, dated March 22, 1901 April 26

Kelly's Directories ld v Gavin & Lloyds appl of plttfs from order of Mr Justice Byrne, dated Jan 24, 1901 April 29

In re the Appln of The National Biscuit Co, U S A, No. 221,736, for Registration of the Trade Mark Uneseda, and Patents, Designs, &c., Acts appl of The National Biscuit Co, U S A, from order of Mr Justice Cozens-Hardy, dated Feb 4, 1901 April 29

The Midland Ry Co v Wright appl of plttfs from order of Mr Justice Byrne, dated Feb 14, 1901 (s o till legal representative appointed) April 30

Owen v Gibbons appl of deff W W Gibbons from order of Mr Justice Justice Farwell, dated March 29, 1901 May 1

Baily v Clark, Son, & Morland ld appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Byrne, dated Feb 4, 1901 May 6

In re The Companies Acts, 1862 to 1893, and In re The National Co for the Distribution of Electricity by Secondary Generators ld appl of the peir Adam Scott in person from order of Mr Justice Wright, dated April 17, 1901 May 7

In re the Patents, Designs & Trade Marks Acts, &c and In re Pearson's Application, No. 216,074 for the registration of the word "Vasogen" and In re the Trade Mark of the Chesebrough, &c Co, Consolidated, "Vaseline," Registered under No. 12,486, in Clauses 3, 4, 47 and 48 in the name of Robert Chesebrough appl of the Chesebrough Manufacturing Co, Consolidated, from the order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated Feb 12, 1901 (and motion for leave to hear further evidence—by order) May 8

In re The Companies Acts, 1862 to 1893 and In re The London & Northern Bank ld (ex pte Gaunt's Executors) appl of CH Slater from order of Mr Justice Wright, dated May 24, 1901 May 8

Whitebread & Co ld v Watt appl of deff from order of Mr Justice Farwell, dated March 22, 1901 May 9

The Great Central Ry Co v The North Eastern Ry Co appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated April 23, 1901 May 9

Home v Jewell appl of deff from order of Mr Justice Farwell, dated May 7, 1901 May 13

In re the Companies Acts, 1862 to 1893, and In re Khoosh ld appl of A W Johnson from order of Mr Justice Wright, dated April 3, 1901 May 14

Hope v Hope appl of plttf in person from order of Mr Justice Cozens-Hardy, dated Feb 21, 1901 (security ordered) May 20

In re Scholefield Turner v Scholefield appl of D H Hammond & anr from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated Feb 5, 1901 May 20

Bateman v Faber appl of deff G D Faber from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated May 10, 1901 (produce order) May 22

In re The Trustees, Executors & Securities Insee Corpn ld v Armstrong appl of plttfs from order of Mr Justice Farwell, dated Feb 12, 1901 (produce order) May 22

National Opalite Glazed Brick & Tile Syndicate ld v New Grand Hotel, Birmingham, ld appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Cozens-Hardy, dated April 23, 1901 May 23

In re The Companies Acts, 1862 to 1900, and In re The Yorkshire Investment and American Mortgage Co ld appl of R Moore from order of Mr Justice Wright, dated April 26, 1901 May 24

In re Schnadhorst Sandkuhl v Schnadhorst appl of plttfs from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated May 4, 1901 May 30

Bellerby v Rowland & Marwoods Co ld appl of plttfs from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated May 15, 1901 June 1

The Transvaal Exploring Land & Minerals Co ld v The Transvaal Lands Co ld appl of plttfs from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated March 19, 1901 June 3

Moffatt & Paige ld v George Gill & Sons ld appl of plttfs from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated April 1, 1901 June 12

In re Ward Pollock v Moore appl of deff from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated March 21, 1901 June 14

In re The Companies Acts, 1862 to 1900, and In re Crichton's Oil Co ld (in voluntary liquidation) appl of David Orichton from order of Mr Justice Wright, dated May 15, 1901 (produce order) June 15

In re South Eastern Ry, &c, Act, 1862 Bath v Bath appl of John Smith Bath from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Jan 17, 1901 June 19

In re Mayhew & In re Ager Housen v Dennis appl of CG Mayhew from order of Mr Justice Byrne, dated April 18, 1901 June 19

In re Hawthorne Bligh v Lynch appl of deff A J Maskell from order of Mr Justice Farwell, dated March 16, 1901 June 20

In re Swan Marshall v Hunter appl of deff J W H Swan from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated Feb 19, 1901 June 27

In re Maddock Llewelyn v Washington appl of defts H Barker, spinster, and ors from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated June 5, 1901 July 3

Greet v Ord appl of deff from order of Mr Justice Farwell, dated June 15, 1901 (security ordered) July 11

Savill Bros ld v Bethell appl of deff from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated April 24, 1901 July 12

In re Pigou, Wilks & Laurence ld Strachey & ors v Pigou, Wilks & Laurence ld appl of deff Co from order of Mr Justice Cozens-Hardy, dated June 6, 1901 July 13

In re Irvine & Coles' Contract & V & P Act, 1874 appl of Duncan Irvine from order of Mr Justice Cozens-Hardy, dated July 8, 1901 July 13

Trollope v Gems appl of deff from order of Mr Justice Farwell, dated April 18, 1901 July 18

The Union Lighterage Co ld v London Graving Dock Co ld appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Cozens-Hardy, dated April 26, 1901 July 18

In re Redman Warton v Redman appl of Elizabeth B Frost from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated June 19, 1901 July 23

In re Puckett & Smith's Contract & V & P Act, 1874 appl of R C Puckett & anr from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated June 29, 1901 July 24

Ashworth v English Card Co appl of plttf from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated June 22, 1901 July 26

In re Moore Prior v Moore appl of deff S T Moore (infant), by F S Lowhis, guardian ad litem, from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated March 14, 1901 July 27

In re Whitmore Walters v Harrison appl of deff A S Harrison from order of Mr Justice Byrne, dated July 4, 1901 July 27

Pilkington v Yeakley Vacuum Hammer Co appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated July 25, 1901 (produce order) July 29

Bradshaw v Widdington and Widdington v Bradshaw appl of J C Bradshaw and anr from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated July 6, 1901 July 30

Chipplin v Mussett appl of deff from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated July 4, 1901 July 30

British Motor Traction Co ld v Friwell appl of plttfs from order of Mr Justice Farwell, dated July 29, 1901 (produce order) Aug 2

In re Smith Russell v Smith appl of defts Arthur Smith and anr from order of Mr Justice Byrne, dated July 23, 1901 (produce order) Aug 2

Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co ld v Cresswell appl of plttfs from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated Aug 6, 1901 (produce order) Aug 7

Richards de Winton Richards v Evans appl of plttf from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated July 4, 1901 Aug 8

Le Mesurier v Le Mesurier appl of deff from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated July 17, 1901 Aug 8

Cackett v Keswick appl of deff W Keswick from order of Mr Justice Farwell, dated July 11, 1901 (produce order) Aug 9 Same v Same appl of deff S W Carlton from order of Mr Justice Farwell, dated July 11, 1901 (produce order) Aug 9 Same v Same appl of deff E O Wheeler from order of Mr Justice Farwell, dated July 11, 1901 (produce order) Aug 9

The City Estates Co ld v Jaffray In re the City Estates Co ld & Jaffray's Contract appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated July 17, 1901 (produce order) Aug 9

The Wath-upon-Deane Urban District Council v Deane Valley Waterworks Co appl of plttfs from order of Mr Justice Cozens-Hardy, dated July 25, 1901 Aug 10

Chaytor v Trotter appl of plttf from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated July 7, 1901 Aug 12

Atkins & Applegarth v The Castner Kellner Alkali Co ld appl of plttfs from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated May 16, 1901 (produce order) Aug 13

Robinson v The London & Northern Bank ld appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated Aug 7, 1901 (produce order) Aug 13

Thomas v Thomas appl of plttf from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated July 1, 1901 (produce order) Aug 13

Rowland v Chapman and other Actions consolidated appl of plttf from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated July 11, 1901 Aug 14

J Ambler & Sons ld v Mayor, &c, of Bradford appl of plttfs from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated Aug 3, 1901 (Interlocutory Appeal No. 3 to come on with this, by order) Aug 16

In re Fish Prestige v Lea appl of deff Jessy Lea from order of Mr Justice Byrne, dated June 6, 1901 Aug 17

Burrows v Lang appl of plttf from order of Mr Justice Farwell, dated May 16, 1901 Aug 17

In re The Urmoston Grange Steamship Co & Co's Acts appl of Houlder Bros & Co ld from order of Mr Justice Wright, dated July 31, 1901 (produce order) Aug 17

In re Willis' Restaurant ld Robinson v Willis' Restaurant ld appl of deff H E Preen from order of Mr Justice Wright, dated July 9, 1901 Aug 19

Aflalo v Lawrence & Bullen ld appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated July 31, 1901 Aug 20

Lord Hastings v The North Eastern Ry Co appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Byrne, dated Aug 8, 1901 (produce order) Aug 26

In re Bryce Brown, dec Brown v Gedney appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Aug 1, 1901 Aug 29

In re Magdalen College, Oxford The London County Council and The President, &c, of St Mary Magdalen College, Oxford appl of The London County Council from order of Mr Justice Cozens-Hardy, dated Aug 8, 1901 Sept 2

In re Perceval Walpole v Perceval appl of deff CM Perceval and anr from order of Mr Justice Farwell, dated May 20, 1901 Sept 19

In re Higdon, dec Hooke v Higdon and ors. appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Farwell, dated July 2, 1901 (produce order) Sept 24

In re Wood Wood v Wood appl of plttf from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Aug 2, 1901 Oct 1

Sproat v Marchese appl of plttf from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated July 30, 1901 Oct 2

Dodson v Downey appl of debt from order of Mr Justice Farwell, dated July 30, 1901 Oct 9

In re The Companies Acts, 1862 to 1893, and In re The Leeds and Hanley Theatres of Varieties Ltd appl of The Consolidated Exploration Finance Co Ltd from order of Mr Justice Wright, dated July 31, 1901 Oct 9

Soden v Vavasour appl of debt from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated June 28, 1901 Oct 10

In re The Earl of Harroby Earl of Harroby v Ryder appl of debt The Hon A E D Ryder from order of Mr Justice Cozens-Hardy, dated July 11, 1901 Oct 12

The Great Western Ry Co v Talbot appl of pliffs from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated June 27, 1901 Oct 15

In re Margeston Margeston v Margeston appl of pliff from order of Mr Justice Byrne, dated July 23, 1901 Oct 17

In re Sutton Lewis v Sutton appl of debt E A V Sutton from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated July 23, 1901 Oct 21

Fleming v Loe Mackusick v Fleming appl of pliff R T Fleming from order of Mr Justice Cozens-Hardy, dated Aug 6, 1901 (produce order) Oct 22

Chaitwell v Dutilh Smith appl of debts from order of Mr Justice Cozens-Hardy, dated Aug 1, 1901 Oct 23

Holmstead v Cooper appl of pliff from order of Mr Justice Cozens-Hardy, dated July 30, 1901 Oct 31

Byrne v Reid appl of pliff from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated July 13, 1901 Nov 2

Same v Same appl of debt S C Byrne from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated July 13, 1901 Nov 2

Barnard Castle Urban District Council v Wilson appl of pliffs from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated Aug 5, 1901 Nov 5

The Liskeard & Looe Ry Co v Liskeard & Caradon Ry Co appl of pliffs from order of Mr Justice Cozens-Hardy, dated Oct 25, 1901 (produce order) Nov 6

In re Walker and Oakshott and the V & P Act, 1874 appl of F Walker & anr from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated June 20, 1901 (produce order) Nov 13

The National Co for the Distribution of Electricity by Secondary Generators v Gibbs appl of Debt H O Ruelle from order of Mr Justice Cozens-Hardy, dated July 11, 1901 Nov 13

In re Sutton Lewis v Sutton appl of pliff from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated July 23, 1901 Nov 18

In re Hotham Hotham v Doughty appl of pliff from order of Mr Justice Cozens-Hardy, dated Nov 2, 1901 November 19

In re The Companies Acts, 1862 to 1890 and In re The Birmingham & Manchester Inace Co, Ltd (expte Howell) appl of the company from order of Mr Justice Byrne, dated Nov 13, 1901 November 27

In re Duval Corbet v Duval appl of debt A C Duval from order of Mr Justice Cozens-Hardy, dated October 25, 1901 December 3

In re Hey Perkins v Hey appl of debts G Hey & anr from order of Mr Justice Byrne, dated Oct 25, 1901 December 4

In re The Registered Trade Marks, Nos 915, 916, and 31,837 of Messrs Bass, Ratcliff, & Gretton, Ltd and Patents, Designs, &c, Acts appl of Bass, Ratcliff, & Gretton from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Nov 28, 1901 (produce order) December 5

In re The Registered Trade Marks, Nos 2, 27, 781, 31,839, 31,840, 43,808, 43,809, and 53,995 of Messrs Bass, Ratcliff, & Gretton, Ltd and Patents, &c, Acts appl of Bass, Ratcliff, & Gretton, Ltd, from an order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Nov 28, 1901 (produce order) December 5

In re Lewis Thomas v Hedley Hedley v Thomas appl of M A Hedley & anr from order of Mr Justice Cozens-Hardy, dated Nov 7, 1901 December 6

Byrne v The Millom & Askam Hematite Iron Co Ltd appl of pliff from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Nov 20, 1901 December 6

In re Martin Martin v Martin appl of debt from Mr Justice Buckley, dated Nov 19, 1901 December 9

Brickwell v Gilbert appl of pliff from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Nov 22, 1901 December 10

Brazier v Glasspool appl of debt from order of Mr Justice Byrne, dated Nov 27, 1901 (produce order) December 10

In re Cabot Brisker v Cabot Cabot v Purnes appl of debt F P Cabot from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Dec 4, 1901 (produce order) December 11

In re Ford Ford v Ford appl of pliff & anr from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated Nov 7, 1901 December 11

Morgan v Pool appl of pliff from order of Mr Justice Byrne, dated Dec 7, 1901 (produce order) December 14

Harrington v Steel appl of debt from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Dec 12 1901 (produce order) December 17

In re Hunt Leppard v Morgan Leppard v Pollard & Settled Land Acts appl of pliffs from order of Mr Justice Farwell, dated Aug 5, 1901 (produce order) December 17

Rumney v The Kent Coal, Finance & Development Co Ltd appl of pliff from order of Mr Justice Byrne, dated Aug 2, 1901 (produce order) December 18

In re The Companies Acts, 1862 to 1890, and In re The Coolgardie Gold Fields Ltd appl of E J Wickenden from order of Mr Justice Wright, dated Dec 12, 1901 (produce order) December 20

FROM THE CHANCERY, PROBATE, AND DIVORCE DIVISIONS. (Interlocutory List.)

Hoxton Brewery Co Ltd v Henry Lovibond & Son Ltd appl of debts Henry Lovibond & Son Ltd from order of Mr Justice Farwell, dated Feb 1, 1901 (produce order) March 1

Williams v Ingram appl of pliff from order of Mr Justice Byrne, dated Feb 26, 1901 (produce order) March 5

J Ambler & Sons Ltd v Mayor, &c of Bedford appl of debts from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated Aug 3, 1901 (to come on with No 109, General List, by order) Aug 15

In re de Almeda Sourdiss v Keyser appl of pliff from order of Mr Justice Cozens-Hardy, dated June 28, 1901 Aug 19

Anderson v Midland Ry Co (from application of Midland Ry Co) appl of pliff from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated Oct 29, 1901 (produce order, security ordered) Nov 9

Anderson v Midland Ry Co (from application of Midland Ry Co) appl of pliff from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated Oct 29, 1901 (produce order, security ordered) Nov 11

In re Lloyd Lloyd v Lloyd appl of R L Allen & anr from order of Mr Justice Farwell, dated Nov 1, 1901 (produce order, security ordered) Nov 15

In re Griffiths Cycle Corp Ltd The Danlop Pneumatic Tyre Co Ltd v The John Griffiths Cycle Corp Ltd appl of Humber & Co Ltd from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated Nov 2, 1901 (produce order) Nov 19

Vavasour v Vavasour appl of pliff from order of Mr Justice Joyce dated Nov 18, 1901 (produce order) Nov 29

White v Harrow Harrow v Marylebone District Property Co, Ltd appl of pliff Stanley Harrow from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated Nov 22, 1901 part heard

Poisson v Robertson appl of pliff F C Poisson from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated Nov 26, 1901

In re The Trouville Pier Co (La Jetee de Trouville), Ltd The London Trust Co, Ltd, & anr v Harding & anr appl of pliffs from refusal of Mr Justice Buckley to grant an injunction, Dec 13, 1901

Commercial Development Co, Ltd v Atkins appl of debt from order of Mr Justice Buckley, dated Dec 6, 1901 December 19

Probate W G Birch v E Birch, A Birch, & ors appl of debts C E Birch & A R Birch from order of Mr Justice Barnes, dated Dec 5, 1901 December 18

In the Matter of Application No 200,462 by Wright, Crossly, & Co for Registration of a Trade Mark, and in the Matter of the Opposition thereto, No 2,657, by the Royal Baking Powder Co of New York appl of Royal Baking Powder Co from order of Mr Justice Byrne, dated Dec 2, 1901 (produce order) December 23

Automatic Machines (Haydon & Urrys Patent, Ltd) v The United Automatic Co appl of pliffs from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated Dec 13, 1901 December 24

FROM THE PROBATE AND DIVORCE DIVISION.

(Final List.)

1901.

Divorce M F Abdy v W N Abdy appl of petur from order of The President, dated Jan 14, 1901 March 23

Probate Richardson v Wood appl of pliff from order of Mr Justice Barnes, dated March 19, 1901 June 12

Probate In re Edmondson Edmondson v Edmondson appl of pliff from order of Mr Justice Barnes, dated March 28, 1901 June 15

Divorce F A H Auger, petur v A L Auger, resp, A H B Johnson, co- resp appl of resp from order of Mr Justice Barnes, dated July 4, 1901 Aug 3

Probate Crickett v Crickett, Eliza Crickett, intervenor appl of intervenor from order of The President, dated July 25, 1901 Aug 3

Probate Crickett v Crickett, Eliza Crickett intervenor appl of pliff from order of The President, dated July 25, 1901 (security ordered) Aug 3

Divorce Kaye v Kaye appl of resp from order of Mr Justice Barnes, dated Aug 8, 1901 Oct 21

Divorce N W Blood v C R Blood appl of applt N W Blood from order of Mr Justice Barnes, dated Nov 18, 1901 Dec 20

FROM THE COUNTY PALATINE COURT OF LANCASTER.

(General List.)

1901.

In re Webster & Jones & V & P Act, 1874, &c appl of James Webster & anr from an order of The Vice-Chancellor of the County Palatine of Lancaster, dated Nov 18, 1901, and cross-notice of appl of respondent, dated Dec 3, 1901 Nov 30

Attorney-Gen of the Duchy of Lancaster v The Chamber Colliery Co Ltd appl of debts from order of the Vice-Chancellor of the County Palatine of Lancaster, dated Nov 15, 1901 (produce order) Dec 14

FROM THE KING'S BENCH DIVISION.

(In Bankruptcy.)

In re Davis, H L (expte The Trustee) from an order made by Mr Justice Wright, dated 28th October, 1901

In re A Debtor (expte The Debtor), No 1,191 of 1901 from a receiving order made by Mr Registrar Linklater, dated 28th November, 1901

In re A Debtor (expte The Debtor), No 1,134 of 1901 from a receiving order made by Mr Registrar Brougham, dated 7th December, 1901

FROM THE KING'S BENCH DIVISION.

For Hearing.

(Final List.)

1901.

Richard Holden Ltd v Bostock & Co Ltd appl of debts from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, dated Feb 7, 1901, without a jury, Manchester Feb 20

Keats v Rendle appl of pliff from judgt of Mr Justice Day, dated Feb 11, 1901, with a jury Feb 28

Remington v Broadwood appl of deft Julia Broadwood from judgt of Mr Justice Bruce, dated Feb 16, 1901, with a common jury, Middlesex Feb 28
Remington v Broadwood appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Bruce, dated Feb 16, 1901, with a common jury, Middlesex (No 2, New Trial, Remington v Broadwood & anr, to follow these two appeals) by order March 2
Fitzpatrick v Evans & Co ld appl of plttf from order of Justices Wills and Channell, dated Feb 9, 1901 Feb 28
Currie v Booth appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated Feb 22, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex March 6
The Mold and Denbigh Junction Ry Co v The London and North-Western Ry Co (Railway and Canal Commission) appl of applicants from judgt of Mr Justice Wright, Sir F Peel and Viscount Cobham, dated Feb 25, 1901 March 7
North Queensland Insee Co ld v The Rhenish Westphalian Lloyd Marine Insee Co ld appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, dated Feb 26, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex March 7
Westworth v Peel appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Lawrance, dated March 9, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex March 12
Carmichael v Abrahams appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated March 4, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex March 12
Kent v Woodward (Crown Side) appl of plttf from judgt of Justices Wills and Channell, dated Feb 6, 1901 March 12
Bonham Carter v Frankeiss appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Day, dated Feb 16, 1901, with special jury, Southampton March 14
Stein & anr v Pope appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated March 9, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex March 13
Summers v Ward appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Ridley, dated Dec 6, 1900, with a common jury, Middlesex March 16
Bingham v Turner appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated March 18, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex March 21
Glasscock v The London, Tilbury, & Southend Ry Co appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated March 13, 1901 (and cross-notice of appl by deft Co for a new trial, dated March 13, 1900), with a special jury, Middlesex March 25
South Wales & Liverpool Steam Ship Co ld v H & C Grayson ld appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Bucknill, dated Feb 21, 1901, without a jury, Liverpool March 26
The London County Council v The Urban District Council of Acton appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Ridley, dated Dec 14, 1900, without a jury, Middlesex March 27
London, Tilbury & Southend Ry Co v The Great Eastern Ry Co (Railway & Canal Commission) appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Wright, dated March 23, 1901 April 3
The Guardians of the Poor of West Ham Union, County of Essex (Appellants) v The London County Council (Respondents) (Crown Side) appl of applts from judgt of Justices Darling & Channell, dated March 21, 1901 April 3
Maxwell v The British Thomson Houston Co ld, Blackwell & Co 3rd parties (Crown Side) appl of defendants from judgt of Mr Justice Kennedy, dated March 27, 1901, with special jury, Leeds April 4
Earl of Craven v Pridmore appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Ridley, dated March 29, 1901, without a jury, Warwick April 12
The King v Dr Tristram & G Davey (Crown Side) appl of Rev H F R Hind & ors from order of Justices Darling & Channell, dated March 21, 1901 April 15
Kinnell v Naser & anr appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Lawrance, dated March 9, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex April 16
Scrutton, Sons, & Co v Sommer & Co (J & R Lister, 3rd parties) appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, dated March 18, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex April 17
Gibbs v Chloride Electrical Storage Syndicate ld appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, dated April 2, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex April 24
Wright v Glyn appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Grantham, dated April 20, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex April 26
The Attorney-General on the relation of the Bromley Rural District Council & anr v Copeland appl of plttf from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice, without a jury, Middlesex April 29
Thrusell v Parsons (Crown Side) appl of plttf William Thrusell (*in formd pauperis*) from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice Lawrance, dated April 18, 1901 by order April 30
Moorby v The Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of the City and County of Kingston upon Hull appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Lawrance, without a jury, dated April 2, 1901 May 1
H B W Foulger v H Arding (Crown Side) appl of plttf from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice Lawrance, dated April 20, 1901 May 2
Hulthen v Stewart & Co appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated April 1, 1901 May 4
Wallenberg v Payne appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, without a jury, dated April 22, 1901 May 6
Keffell's Boxley Brewery ld v Hughes appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Ridley, dated April 22, 1901, and common jury, Middlesex May 6
Hainsworth v British Workman's and General Assurance Co ld appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Kennedy, dated April 18, 1901, and special jury, Leeds May 8
The Reversionary & General Securities Co ld v Gillon appl of plttfs from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated April 30, 1901, without a jury May 8
Robert Skene v Charles Cook (Crown Side) appl of plttf from judgt of Justices Channell & Darling, dated March 22, 1901 May 8

The Zillah Shipping Co ld v The Midland Ry Co (Crown Side) appl of defts from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice & Mr Justice Lawrance, dated April 18, 1901 May 8
In re an Arbitration Messrs Ford & Co and Messrs Bemrose & Sons ld and **In re The Arbitration Act, 1889** appl of Bemrose & Sons ld from judgt of Justices Kennedy and Phillimore, dated April 30, 1901 May 11
Frangopol & Co v Lomas & Co appl of plttfs from judgt of Mr Justice Kennedy, dated April 23, 1901 May 13
Nicholls v Parker & anr appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Wright, dated May 7, 1901 May 14
The Property Exchange ld, applts v The Board of Works for the Wandsworth District, now The Mayor, Aldermen and Councillors of the Metropolitan Borough of Wandsworth, respts (Crown Side) appl of applts from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice Lawrance, dated April 18, 1901 May 14
In re an Arbitration between Cowley & Co of the one part and Thomas Morrison of the other part appl of Morrison & Co from judgt of Justices Kennedy and Phillimore, dated May 6, 1901 May 17
In re an Arbitration between Henry Tyrer & Co of the one part and Hessler & Co, owners, of the other part appl of Hessler & Co from judgt of Justices Kennedy and Phillimore, dated May 2, 1901 May 20
Day and anr v Powell and anr appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated April 19, 1901, without jury, Middlesex May 21
Gros and ors v Barnett appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Grantham, dated May 22, 1901 May 22
Rev G N Herbert, applt v J A M Quade (Surveyor of Taxes), respt (Revenue Side) appl of respt from judgt of Justices Kennedy and Phillimore, dated May 9, 1901 part heard (so for additional facts)
Gates and ors v Bill appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Ridley, dated May 14, 1901, with a jury May 24
The Caridad Copper Mining Co ld v Swallow appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Wright, dated May 14, 1901 May 24
Fraser v Walke appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Grantham, dated May 17, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex May 31
In re an Arbitration between the owners of the Steamship Istok and Fred Drughorn appl of deft from judgt of Justices Kennedy and Phillimore, dated May 17, 1901 May 29
Martingell v Brown appl of plttf from judgt of Justices Ridley and Phillimore, dated May 21, 1901 May 29
Aktieselskabet Shakespeare v C J Ekin & Co appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham and Commercial Court, dated March 6, 1901 May 30
Patrick Igoo (appellants) v Thomas Thorahill Shann and ors, Jj of the Peace for the County and City of Manchester (respts) (Crown Side) appl of respts from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice Lawrance, dated May 7, 1901 May 31
In re an Arbitration The Bwlfa & Merthyr Dars Steam Collieries (1891) ld v The Pontypridd Waterworks Co appl of defts from judgt of Justices Ridley and Phillimore, dated May 22, 1901 June 5
The County Council of the Administrative County of Hertford v The Rural District Council of Barnet appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Lawrance, dated May 17, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex June 13
Fractions Times & Co v Meade appl of plttfs from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, dated May 22, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex June 18
Lord Portsmouth and anr v The London and South Western Railway Co appl of plttfs from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated May 22, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex June 24
Same v Same appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated May 22, 1901 June 24
The Turnchapel Wharves & Warehouses ld v Pitts, Son & King ld appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Grantham, dated June 15, 1901, with a special jury, Middlesex June 25
John Marshall v The Royal Exchange Assoc Corpn appl of plttf from judgt of Justices Ridley and Phillimore, dated May 22, 1901, with special jury, Middlesex June 25
New River Co v Assessment Committee of Hertford Union and ors (Crown Side) appl of respts from judgt of Justices Ridley and Bigham, dated June 11, 1901 June 25
The Associated Portland Cement Manufacturers (1900) ld and ors v Tolhurst appl of plttfs from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew, dated June 12, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex (Commercial List) June 26
Tolhurst v The Associated Portland Cement Manufacturers (1900) ld and ors appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew, dated June 12, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex June 26
B H Abrahams v Bullock appl of plttfs from judgt of Mr Justice Ridley, dated June 6, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex June 26
Gunn v Showell's Brewery Co ld and ors appl of defts Showell's Brewery Co ld from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated June 7, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex June 28
Squire v Hussey appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Grantham, dated June 8, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex (security ordered) June 28
Wertheim v Thomas Owen & Co ld appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew, dated May 7, 1901, and cross notice of appeal by defts (from part of same order) without a jury, Middlesex July 1
The Corporation of the Royal Exchange Assurance v Sjöforsäkrings Aktie Bolaget Vega appl of plttfs from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, dated June 15, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex July 4
Whinney v Bowman appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated June 29, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex July 5
Favots v Morry appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Ridley, dated June 25, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex July 5
Michel v Day appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Ridley, dated June 26, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex July 5

- Taylor v Tombs and Same v Same appl of pliffs from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated July 4, 1901, with common jury, Middlesex (two actions consolidated, by order) July 8
- Hedley v Rippin & ors appl of pliff from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated July 3, 1901, with common jury, Middlesex (security ordered) July 12
- Vickers, Sons & Maxim ld v Midland Ry Co & ors (Railway and Canal Commission) appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Wright, Sir F. Peel and Viscount Cobham, dated July 10, 1901 July 13
- Reffell's Bexley Brewery ld v Hughes appl of deft from judgment of Mr Justice Ridley, dated June 24, 1901, with common jury, Middlesex July 15
- Osborne v Quarry Publishing Co ld appl of pliff from judgt of Mr Justice Ridley, dated May 6, 1901, with a jury, Middlesex (security ordered) July 16
- Burdett & Harris v Macleay appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated July 8, 1901 July 16
- Pain Bros v Macleay appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated July 8, 1901 July 16
- Daines, Adam & Co v Macleay appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated July 6, 1901 July 16
- Mercer v The Liverpool, St Helens and South Lancashire Ry Co appl of defts from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice, dated June 24, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex July 17
- Tredegear Iron & Coal Co ld v Hawthorn Bros & Co appl of pliffs from order of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated June 26, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex July 18
- Rosenthal Bros (Appellants) v Relfern & Son (Respondents) (Crown Side) appl of defts from judgt of Justices Channell and Bucknill, dated 28th June, 1901 July 20
- Steel, Young, & Co v Grand Canary Coaling Co appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated July 15, 1901 July 29
- Charles Cammell & Co v The Midland Ry Co & ors (Railway and Canal Commission) appl of Midland Ry Co from judgt of Mr Justice Wright, Sir F. Peel, and Viscount Cobham, dated July 10, 1901 July 31
- John Brown & Co ld v The Midland Ry Co & ors (Railway and Canal Commission) appl of Midland Ry Co from judgt of Mr Justice Wright, Right Hon Sir F. Peel, and Viscount Cobham, dated July 10, 1901 July 31
- Mitchell v Richard Evans & Co ld appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Bucknill, dated July 26, 1901, without a jury Aug 2
- Mediterranean and New York Steam Ship Co v Mackay appl of pliffs from judgt of Mr Justice Bucknill, dated July 6, 1901, with special jury, Manchester Aug 3
- George Nelson & Sons v James and Alexander Brown appl of pliffs from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew, dated July 30, 1901, without a jury Aug 5
- Preston (trading as John Preston) v Furness, Withy & Co appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew, and cross notice of appeal by pliff from same order, dated July 31, 1901, without a jury Aug 7
- Nigel Gold, & Co v Hoarde appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew, dated July 26, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex Aug 7
- The Kingwell Steamship Co ld v F W Marten appl of pliffs from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew, dated July 26, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex Aug 7
- Neustadt v Lambert appl of deft from judgt Mr Justice Mathew, dated July 26, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex Aug 8
- Handby v Wolverhampton Race Course and Dunstall Park Club Co ld appl of pliff from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated July 24, 1901, without a jury, Stafford Aug 8
- A E Preston (liquidator of the Cheap Wood Co, ld) v Churchill & Sim appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew, dated July 31, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex Aug 8
- Robinson Gold Mining Co ld and ors v Alliance Marine and General Assurance Co, ld appl of pliffs from judgt of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated July 15, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex Aug 9
- C H A Dougherty v E Richards & Co appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated July 31, 1901, common jury, Middlesex Aug 9
- Dunn & ors v Donald Currie & Co & Bucknall Bros appl of defts Bucknall Bros from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew, dated Aug 2, 1901, Middlesex Aug 10
- Elliott v Longden appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated July 2, 1901, and common jury, Middlesex (security ordered) Aug 15
- Craig v Philip appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Grantham, dated June 25, 1901, and special jury, Middlesex Aug 16
- Ben Graham & ors (trading, &c) v The Commissioners of His Majesty's Works & Public Buildings appl of defts from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice, dated Aug 6, 1901, and special jury, Leeds Aug 15
- Pearce v Greening appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Wills, dated Aug 6, 1901, without jury, Exeter Aug 20
- Carter v Leyson appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated Aug 9, 1901, without jury, Birmingham Aug 22
- Curtis & Co v Head appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew, dated July 29, 1901, without Middlesex Aug 23
- The Steamship Carisbrook Co ld v London & Provincial Marine & General Insee Co ld appl of pliff from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew, dated Aug 7, 1901, without jury, Middlesex Aug 31
- Sir William Dunn & ors v Donald Currie & Co and ors appl of defts Donald Currie & Co from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew, dated Aug 2, 1901, without jury, Middlesex Sept 7
- Molinsaux v The London, Birmingham & Manchester Insurance Co ld appl of pliff from judgt of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated Aug 6, 1901, without jury, Birmingham Sept 12
- The Long Eaton Recreation Grounds Co ld v The Midland Railway Co appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Lawrance, dated Aug 12, 1901, non-jury, Derby Sept 16
- Ratcliff & Dealtry v A B Mendelssohn appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew, dated Aug 7, 1901, non-jury, Middlesex Sept 16
- Honikman v Stopford & ors appl of pliff from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated Aug 9, 1901, non-jury, Middlesex Oct 9
- H F Van Laun & Co v Baring Bros ld appl of pliff from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, dated July 3, 1901, non-jury, Middlesex Oct 9
- Reid v J B Lee & Sons & ors appl of pliffs from judgt of Mr Justice Kennedy, dated Aug 9, 1901, non-jury, Middlesex Oct 9
- Scott & Horton v Godfrey appl of pliffs from judgt of Mr Justice (Commercial), dated June 27, 1901, non-jury, Middlesex Oct 23
- Bridgwater & Smith v Godfrey appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice (Commercial List), dated Aug 2, 1901 (non-jury) Oct 23
- Wallis Chlorine Syndicate ld v American Alkali Co ld appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Grantham, dated July 6, 1901, with special jury, Middlesex Oct 23
- The Mayor, &c of Truro v Rowe appl of pliff from judgt of Mr Justice Wills, dated Aug 10, 1901 Oct 23
- Same v Kemp appl of pliffs from judgt of Mr Justice Wills, dated Aug 5, 1901 Oct 23
- Vogemann v Zanzibar Steamship Co ld appl of pliff from judgt of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated July 15, 1901, without jury, Middlesex Oct 24
- Renton & Co v Midland Railway Co & ors (Railway and Canal Commission) appl of Midland Ry Co from judgt of Mr Justice Wright, Sir F. Peel, and Viscount Cobham, dated July 10, 1901 Oct 29
- Lloyds Bank ld v Gerard Moseley appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Wills, dated Aug 6, 1901, without a jury, Bristol Oct 31
- Hoare & Co ld v Met Borough of Lewisham appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Lawrance, dated Aug 12, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex Nov 1
- J W Hemmant v G Hemmant appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Bruce, dated Aug 9, 1901, without a jury, Leeds Nov 5
- Titchfield Bank ld v Irwin & ors appl of pliffs from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated Nov 2, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex Nov 6
- Wyler v The Ibo Investment Trust ld appl of pliff for judgt of Mr Justice Walton, dated Oct 31, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex Nov 11
- Mayor of Westminster, applt v Edgcombe, respt (Crown Side) appl of respt from order of The Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice Ridley, dated Oct 25, 1901 Nov 12
- Ward Bros v James Hill & Sons appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Wills, dated Aug 6, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex Nov 14
- In the Matter of Casson P Smith, a solr, &c, and In the Matter of the Solicitors Act, 1888 appl of C P Smith from judgt of Justices Kennedy and Darling, dated Aug 8, 1901 Nov 18
- The Electrolytic Plating Apparatus Co ld v Henry Holland Co appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Ridley, dated Nov 6, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex Nov 19
- Same v John Birch & Sons ld appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Ridley, dated Nov 6, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex Nov 19
- George v Coates appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Ridley, dated Nov 7, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex Nov 21
- Temple, Thomson & Clark v Runnalls appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham (Commercial Cause), dated Nov 5, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex Nov 23
- Trustee of G Mellor a bankrupt v Maas appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Wright, dated Nov 8, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex Nov 23
- Sykes v Curtis & ors appl of G Murray (3rd party) from judgt of Mr Justice Ridley, dated Nov 19, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex Nov 26
- Sponser & anr v Day appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Wright, dated Nov 21, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex Nov 28
- Holt v Wren appl of E Holt, pliff, from judgt of Mr Justice Wills, dated 1901, District Registry, Blackburn Nov 27
- Bolton v Pidaley & Co appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Ridley, dated Nov 18, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex (security ordered) Nov 29
- Simon v Hillarn (trading, &c) appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated Nov 16, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex Nov 30
- Cooke v Payne appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Wright, dated Nov 21, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex Nov 30
- Mills v Sparrow v The Atlantic Transport Co ld appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Walton, dated Nov 18, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex Nov 30
- Zimber & anr v Abrahams appl of pliffs from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated Nov 23, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex December 4
- Lewis v Berkley & anr appl of pliff from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated Nov 16, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex December 5
- Basset v Maudslay appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Bucknill, dated Nov 26, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex December 6
- Philip v Bennett & Co appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, dated Nov 29, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex December 6
- Wilcock v Greig appl of pliff from judgt of Mr Darling, dated Nov 29, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex December 6
- In re an Arbitration between R Craggs & Sons and John Lookie appl of deft John Lookie from order of Mr Justice Wright (on special case), dated Nov 28, 1901 December 9
- In re an Arbitration between Lord Mostyn and F H Fitzsimmons appl of Lord Mostyn from order of Mr Justice Wright (on special case), dated Nov 27, 1901 December 11
- The Mutual Loan Fund Assoc ld v Friend appl of pliffs from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated Nov 30, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex Dec 12

Collins v
Walton
Harris &
Justice
Wyatt v
Justice
Hansfater
from ju
jury, M
Green
dated
Charring
Commis
Viscou
The Lon
Midlan
By Co
FROM

Oringde
Owen
Presid
Mount
Sheph
Barn
Oceani
Steam
dated

Swind
Swin
the L

Woolle
trial
befor
Apri

Remm
or n
trial
No.
Vicars
pliff
5, 1
July
Taylor
shir
Aug
Mid
Hend
jud
at
Nov
Batte
or i
bef
Bark
ver
an
Spec
ver
an
Whit
an
spe
Smil
for
190
De
Neel
fro
Ju
Smil
po
19
De
Self
ju
at

Railway Co v *Collins v Lake View Consols* ld appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Walton, dated Nov 2, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex Dec 12
Harris & Co v Davis & Co, ld & anr appl of pliffs from judgt of Mr Justice Wright, dated Dec 6, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex Dec 13
Wyatt v The London County Council appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Wright, dated Dec 9, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex Dec 16
Hanfstaengl v The British Mutoscope & Biograph Co ld appl of plfff from judgt of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated Dec 4, 1901, with a common jury, Middlesex Dec 19
Green v Lydall & anr appl of plfff from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated Nov 29, 1901, without a jury, Middlesex Dec 20
Charrington, Sells, Dale & Co v The Midland Ry Co (Railway & Canal Commission) appl of defts from Mr Justice Wright, Sir F Peel and Viscount Cobham, dated Dec 5, 1901 December 21
The London & India Docks Co v The Great Eastern Ry Co and the Midland Ry Co (Railway and Canal Commission) appl of the Midland Ry Co from judgt, dated Dec 13, 1901 December 21

FROM THE PROBATE, DIVORCE AND ADMIRALTY DIVISION (ADMIRALTY).

FOR HEARING.

(Final List.)

With Nautical Assessors.

1901.

Ovingdean Grange 1901 Folios 337 and 338 *Owners of Forsete v Owners of Ovingdean Grange (damage)* appl of pliffs from judgt of the President, dated Feb 15, 1901 May 1
Mount Vernon 1899 Folio 533 *Owners of the Handel Lust v George Shephard and ors (damage)* appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Barnes, dated April 30, 1901 July 1
Oceanic 1901 Folio 357 *The Waterford Steamship Co ld v The Oceanic Steamship Co ld (damage)* appl of defts from judgt of the President, dated Oct 29, 1901 Nov 11

Without Nautical Assessors.

(Final List.)

Swindon 1901 Folio 52 *Millers & Carys Cape Verde Islands ld v The Swindon Steamship Co ld (question of Law)* appl of deft from judgt of the Divisional Court, dated June 14, 1901 July 24

FROM THE KING'S BENCH DIVISION.

(New Trial Paper.)

1899.

Woolley v Manchester Ship Canal Co appln of defts for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated March 13, 1899, at trial before T H Baylis, Esq, and special jury (Court of Passage, Liverpool) April 19

1901.

Remington v Broadwood and anr appln of deft A S Broadwood for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Feb 15, 1901, at trial before Mr Justice Bruce and common jury, Middlesex (to follow No. 37 final appeal, by order) March 12

Vicars v The Hydro Incandescent Gas Light Co ld and others appln of plfff for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated July 5, 1901, at trial before Mr Justice Lawrence and special jury, Middlesex July 13

Taylor v London & Yorkshire Bank ld & anr appln of London & Yorkshire Bank for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated August 9, 1901, at trial before the Lord Chief Justice and a jury Middlesex Oct 30

Henderson v Bateman and legal representatives & ors appln of plfff for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Oct 28, 1901, at trial before Mr Justice Grantham and a special jury, Middlesex Nov 1

Batten, Carne & Carne's Banking Co ld v Reed appln of pliffs for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Nov 6, 1901, at trial before Mr Justice Grantham and a special jury, Middlesex Nov 12

Barker v Sullivan & ors appln of deft for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Nov 1, 1901, at trial before Mr Justice Ridley and a special jury, Middlesex November 14

Spero v Creswell & ors appln of plfff for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Nov 28, 1901, at trial before Mr Justice Darling and common jury, Middlesex December 2

White v Bennet appln of plfff for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Nov 30, 1901, at trial before Mr Justice Ridley with a special jury, Middlesex December 4

Smith v Mair & ors appln of defts A McKechnie and McKechnie Bros for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Nov 25, 1901, at trial before Mr Justice Ridley with a special jury, Middlesex December 5

Nesbitt v Parrett & Mercer appln of defts for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Nov 29, 1901, at trial before Lord Chief Justice & a special jury, Middlesex December 6

Smith & Co ld v Humphries & Co ld appln of pliffs (on a preliminary point) for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Dec 6, 1901, at trial before Mr Justice Darling and a special jury, Middlesex Dec 16

Selle, Ball, Smith, & Co v Tribe, Clarke, Painter & Co appln of pliffs for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Dec 3, 1901, at trial before Mr Justice Darling and a special jury, Middlesex Dec 17

Mann v Roberts appln of defts for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Dec 10, 1901, at trial before Mr Justice Phillimore and a common jury, Middlesex Dec 17

Aitken v The London & North Western Ry Co appln of defts for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Dec 11, 1901, at trial before Mr Justice Darling with a special jury, Middlesex Dec 18

Knight v Vickerman appln of plfff for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Dec 5, 1901, at trial before Mr Justice Grantham and special jury, Leeds December 19

Vickers v Lady Emily Gold Mining Co, ld appln of defts for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Dec 12, 1901, at trial before Mr Justice Darling and a special jury, Middlesex December 20

Philips v Plumbly appln of deft for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Dec 13, 1901, at trial before Mr Justice Darling and a special jury, Middlesex December 21

FROM THE KING'S BENCH DIVISION.

(Interlocutory List.)

1900.

Matthews & ors v Colls & anr appl of plfff from order of Mr Justice Bucknill, dated June 13, 1900 (security ordered) June 26

1901.

Nelson v Rosenberg appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Day, dated March 18, 1901 (s o pending settlement) March 21

Underhill & anr v Lindon appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Day, dated March 25, 1901 (security ordered) April 18

Vigo v Vigo appl of plfff from order of Mr Justice Day, dated April 20, 1901 *Vigo v Vigo* appl of plfff from order of Mr Justice Day, dated April 17, 1901 (s o till after Master's report) April 24

Wells & ors v The New London Discount Co ld & ors appl of plfff from order of Mr Justice Jelf, dated Nov 12, 1901 Nov 28

Hickman v Ward (Scott, clmt) appl of Jett H Ward from order of Mr Justice Channell, dated Dec 11, 1901 Dec 16

Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co ld & anr v Actien Gesellschaft Fuhr Motor, &c (Crown Side) from order of Mr Justice Channell, dated Dec 13, 1901 Dec 18

Wallach & Richardson v Marshall (Crown Side) appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated Dec 17, 1901 Dec 19

Clayton v Shortt appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Channell, dated Dec 9, 1901 Dec 20

Cornwell v Craddock appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated Dec 16, 1901 Dec 21

FROM COUNTY COURT.

In re The Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897.

1901.

In the Matter, &c *W E Jones (an infant)* by William Williams next friend, applicant v *Lawrence & Nicol, respts (Crown Side)* appl of applicant from award of County Court (Lancashire, Liverpool), dated Jan 24, 1901 (restored) Feb 14

In the Matter, &c *Elizabeth Jarrett (the legal personal representative of W Jarrett, dec), applicant v The Foldau Collieries Co ld, respts (Crown Side)* appl of respts from award of County Court (Glamorganshire, Bridgend), dated May 24, 1901 June 6

In re the Matter, &c *John Owen, applicant v George Clark ld, respt (Crown Side)* appl of applicant from award of County Court (Durham, Sunderland), dated May 16, 1901 June 6

Stand over till after judgment given in "Wrigley v Whittaker" in House of Lords (by order)

In the Matter, &c *Richard Perry, applicant v Joseph Baker & Sons, respts (Crown Side)* appl of applicant from award of County Court (Middlesex, Marylebone), dated June 17, 1901 (security ordered) July 6

In the Matter, &c *George Bartell, applicant v W Gray & Co, respts (Crown Side)* appl of respts from award of County Court (Middlesex, Bow), dated July 10, 1901 July 22

In the Matter, &c *John Henry Matthews, applicant v The Penrkyber Navigation Colliery Co ld, respts (Crown Side)* appl of respts from award of County Court (Glamorganshire, Aberdare & Mountain Ash), dated July 8, 1901 July 27

In the Matter, &c *Abraham McDougall, applicant v Holzapfel's Composition Co ld, respts (Crown Side)* appl of applicant from award of County Court (Lancashire, Liverpool), dated Sept 13, 1901 (security ordered) Sept 24

In the Matter, &c *Joseph Veazey, applicant v Henry Chattle respt (Crown Side)* appl of respt from award of County Court (Derbyshire, Derby), dated Sept 10, 1901 Sept 28

In the Matter, &c *Morris, applicant v Darcy Lever Coal Co ld, respt, and the Northern Employers' Mutual Indemnity Co ld (insurers) (Crown Side)* appl of insurers from award of County Court (Lancashire, Bolton), dated Sept 23, 1901 Oct 7

In the Matter, &c *Mary Eaton (widow), applicant v J E Edwards, respt (Crown Side)* appl of respt from award of County Court (Denbighshire, Wrexham), dated Oct 2, 1901 Oct 16

In the Matter, &c *William Male, applicant v Nixon's Navigation Co ld, respts (Crown Side)* appl of respts from award of County Court (Glamorganshire, Mountain Ash), dated Sept 30, 1901 Oct 19

In the Matter, &c *Hannah Williams, applicant v Powell Duffryn Steam Coal Co ld respts (Crown Side)* appl of respts from award of County Court (Monmouthshire, Tredegar), dated Oct 8, 1901 Oct 25

In the Matter, &c Charles Fletcher, applicant v The London United Tramways Id, respts (Crown Side) appl of applicant from award of County Court (Middlesex, Brentford), dated Oct 25, 1901 Oct 25

In the Matter, &c Eliza Clatworthy, applicant v R & H Green Id, respts (Crown Side) appl of respts from award of County Court (Middlesex, Bow), dated Oct 17, 1901 Oct 26

In the Matter, &c Thomas Needham, applicant v George Leeder, respt (Crown Side) appl of applicant from award of County Court (Durham, Hartlepool), dated Oct 11, 1901 (security ordered) Oct 30

In the Matter, &c William Henry St George, applicant v The Lighting Corporation Id, respts (Crown Side) appeal of respts from award of County Court (Surrey, Croydon), dated Oct 15, 1901 Nov 1

In the Matter, &c Elizabeth Jane Fairey, applicant v John Rathe, respt (Crown Side) appl of respt from award of County Court (Chester, Birkenhead), dated Oct 28, 1901 Nov 1

In the Matter, &c Henry Armitage, applicant v The Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Co, respts (Crown Side) appl of respts from award of County Court (Lancashire, Manchester), dated Oct 21, 1901 Nov 4

In the Matter, &c William Jobson McMillan, applicant v The Prince of Wales Dry Dock Co. Id, respts (Crown Side) appl of respts from award of County Court (Glamorganshire, Swansea), dated Oct 22, 1901 Nov 8

In the Matter, &c Nancy Waby, applicant v The Sheffield Mineral Water Syndicate Id respts (Crown Side) appl of respts from award of County Court (Yorkshire, Sheffield), dated Oct 31, 1901 Nov 11

In the Matter, &c James Carney, applicant v Walton Scott & Middleton Id, respts (Crown Side) appl of applicant from award of County Court (Yorkshire, Sheffield), dated Oct 24, 1901 (security ordered) Nov 13

In the Matter, &c Robert Ashton, applicant v Callender's Cable & Construction Co Id, respts (Crown Side) appl of applicant from award of County Court (Yorkshire, Sheffield), dated Oct 25, 1901 (security orderd) Nov 13

In the Matter, &c Alice Howell, applicant v Eastwood, Swinger & Co Id and Aird & Sons, respts (Crown Side) appl of applicant from award of County Court (Surrey, Southwark), dated Oct 28, 1901 Nov 18

In the Matter, &c Frederick Burnett, applicant v The Drury Lane Theatre Id, respts (Crown Side) appl of respts from award of County Court (Middlesex, Shoreditch), dated Nov 15, 1901 Nov 21

In the Matter, &c Charles Goodwin, applicant v Scruttons Id, respts (Crown Side) appl of applicant from award of County Court (Essex, Grays), dated Nov 9, 1901 Nov 22

In the Matter, &c George Hughes, the younger (by George Hughes, his father and next friend), applicant v The Lancashire & Yorkshire Ry Co, respts (Crown Side) appl of applicant from award of County Court (Lancashire, Manchester), dated Nov 4, 1901 Nov 23

In the Matter, &c Thomas Redden, applicant v Siddal & Hilton Id, respts (Crown Side) appl of applicant from award of County Court (Yorkshire, Halifax), dated Nov 7, 1901 Nov 27

In the Matter, &c Hannah Southern, applicant v The Abram Coal Co. Id, respts (Crown Side) appl of respts from award of County Court (Lancashire, Wigan), dated Dec 3, 1901 Dec 18

In the Matter, &c Samuel Kniverton, applicant v The Darcy Lever Coal Co. Id, and The Northern Employers' Mutual Indemnity Co. Id, respts (Crown Side) appl of insurers from award of County Court (Lancashire, Bolton), dated Dec 4, 1901 Dec 20

N.B.—The above list contains Chancery, Palatine, and King's Bench Final and Interlocutory Appeals set down to December 24, 1901.

THE PROPERTY MART.

SALES OF THE ENSUING WEEK.

Jan 22.—Messrs. DOUGLAS YOUNG & Co., at the Mart, at 2: A valuable Corner Freehold Building Site, adjoining Ludgate-circus, having a total frontage to Fleet-street, Bride-lane, and St. Bride's-avenue of 78 ft. Sin., and covering an area of about 550 square feet. (See advertisement, Jan 11, p. 2.)

RESULT OF SALES.

Messrs. H. E. FORTY & CRANFIELD were successful in selling at the Mart, &c. on Wednesday last, a valuable and nicely timbered Freehold Building Estate of about 2a. 1r. 10p., forming a portion of Cranbrook Park, Ilford, and ripe for immediate development. The property was sold for £25,350, or practically £1,000 per acre.

REVERSIONS AND LIFE POLICIES.

The same firm also sold at the Mart, on Thursday last, at their usual Fortnightly Sale (No. 707) of the above interests, the following at the prices named, the total of sale being £3,015.

ABSOLUTE REVERSION TO ONE-TWELFTH OF £20,541; life 75			
LIFE POLICIES:			
For £5,000, without profits; life 43	730
For £500, with profits; life 63	175
For £1,000, with profits; life 63	705
For £500, with profits; life 70	265

WARNING TO INTENDING HOUSE PURCHASERS AND LESSORS.—Before purchasing or renting a house, even for a short occupation, it is advisable to have the Drains and Sanitary Arrangements independently Tested and Reported upon. For terms apply to The Sanitary Engineering Co. (H. Carter, C.E., Manager), 65, Victoria-street, Westminster. Established 27 years. Telegrams: Sanitation, London. Telephone: 316 Westminster.—[ADVT.]

FOR THROAT IRRITATION AND COUGH "Epps's Glycerine Jujubes" always prove effective. They soften and clear the voice, and are invaluable to all suffering from cough, soreness, or dryness of the throat. Sold only in labelled tins, price 7d. and 1s. 1d. James Epps & Co., Ltd., Homoeopathic Chemists, London.—[ADVT.]

WINDING UP NOTICES.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, JAN. 10.
JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.
LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

DIAMONTPONTAIN ESTATES, LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before Feb 12, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Henry St John Hodges, Finsbury House, Blomfield st. Mayo & Co., Drapers' gins, solers for the liquidator.

PETROLITE FUEL STADIUM, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Feb 15, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to James Bartram Wishing, 3, Cross in Eastcheap. Travers Smith & Co., 4, Throgmorton av

PUNJAB ICE CO. LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before March 1, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Trinder & Co. 155, Leadenhall st

SMALL FARM AND LABOURERS LAND CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Feb 20, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Thomas Henry Butcher and Thomas Arthur Dickson, 57, Lincoln's Inn fields. Ball & Co, Lincoln's Inn fields, solers for liquidators

WHITMAN MINING CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before March 1, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Thomas Postlethwaite Bragg, 55, Lowther st, Whitehaven. Brockbank & Co, Whitehaven, solers to liquidator

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, JAN. 14.
JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.
LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

R. RHODES & CO, LIMITED (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before Feb 25, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Mr F. H. Bonham, 88, Richmond rd, Bradford. Rawnsley & Pearson, Bradford, solers for liquidator

BOTTING, NICHOLSON & SPENCER, LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before Feb 25, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William Nicholson, 12, Wood st. Campion & Co, Queen st, solers to liquidator

DRUGGISTS PRINTING AND PUBLISHING CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Jan 27, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Mr Ernest Layton Bennett, 55, Bishopsgate st Steadman & Van Praagh, Old Broad st, solers to liquidator

HAWTHORN LIME, LIMITED—Peta for winding up, presented Jan 8, directed to be held Jan 23. Botterell & Roche, 101, Leadenhall st, solers for peters. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Jan 23

JOHN SHONE & CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Feb 10, to send their names and addresses, with particulars of their debts or claims, to Sydney George Hayward, 1, Dodington, Whitechurch, Salop

POTTERY PRINTING MACHINE CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Feb 7, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Arthur Price Llewellyn, Tunstall. Llewellyn & Son, Tunstall, solers for the liquidator

CREDITORS' NOTICES. UNDER ESTATES IN CHANCERY.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.
London Gazette.—FRIDAY, JAN. 10.

SIMMONS, ISAAC, Clephane rd, Canonbury, Ostich Feather Manufacturer Feb 15 HARRIS v SIMMONS, COHEN-HARDY, J. Colyer & Colyer, Wyth st, Strand

SPEAKMAN, CHARLES ARTHUR, Leadenhall st, Coal Merchant Jan 31 Carroll v HARRIS, Registrar, Liverpool HARRIS, Lincoln's Inn fields

STONEHAM, SYDNEY DUKE AILEY, St Michael's House, Cornhill, Solicitor Feb 13 Schmettau v Stoneham, Swinsea Eady, J. Dunn, Clement's Is

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, JAN. 14.

POLLOCK HARRY FREDERICK, St Helen's pl, Solicitor Feb 25 Branton, Bourke, & Co v Trotter, Buckley, J. Crisp, Throgmorton av

UNDER 22 & 23 VICI. CAP. 35.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.
London Gazette.—FRIDAY, JAN. 8.

ATKINSON, SOPHIA ANN, York Feb 25 Turner, York

BALLAM, DANIEL, Lyndale, nr Poole Jan 29 BOND, HENRY SIMON, Bristol Feb 7 Fletcher, Leeds

BOVEY, EDWARD, Buckfastleigh, Devon Jan 31 Tucker & Son, Ashburton

BROCKBANK, JAMES, Beckside, Cumberland Feb 6 Brockbank & Co, Whitehaven

BROWN, CATHERINE, Burton on Trent Feb 13 J & W J. Drewry, Burton on Trent

CAMPBELL, FRANK HERBERT, Liverpool Feb 23 Rigby & Heron, Liverpool

CASELBY, HARRIET, Bamsen pk rd, Shepherd's Bush Jan 31 Butt, Walbrook

CARRAIGNE, MARION HARRIET, Hawley rd, Kenilworth Jan 28 Simpson & Co, Moor-gate st

COLES, JAMES, New Wimbledon, Surrey, Baker Feb 27 Vant, Warwick st, Pall Mall

CORANT, EDWARD NATHANIEL, Lyndon Hall, Rutland Feb 10 Pyke & Patrot, Lincoln's Inn fields

DALGLEISH, ISABELLA WALLACE, BAYNES, Surrey Jan 25 Bamford, Chiswick

FISHER, EDWARD KNAPP, Market Harborough, Leicester Feb 1 Fisher & Son, Buckingham gate, Westminster

FOSTER, WILLIAM FRANCIS, Queen Anne st, Cavendish sq Feb 8 Ford & Co, Bloomsbury sq

GARTY, MARTHA, Gt Driffield March 1 Foster & Co, Gt Driffield

GROVER, ELIZABETH ANNE, Knightsbridge Feb 12 Leighton & Savory, Clement's Is

HARVEY, ANN ELIZABETH, Swindon Feb 23 Foreman & Fridham, Swindon

HUNT, SARAH, Walworth Feb 3 Fleming, Southwark

JOWEY, RICHARD, Billingham, Durham Feb 1 Fryer, West Hartlepool

LIVSTON-SIMMONS, ELIZABETH JULIA, Clevedon, Somerset Feb 28 Wood, Wington, B30, Somerset

LIVINGSTON, JOSEPH GIBBONS, JP, Liverpool Jan 31 Whitley & Co Liverpool

LIVINGSTON, MARGARET, Waverley, Liverpool Jan 31 Whitley & Co, Liverpool

LEWELLYN, ANNE, Abchurch Ln Feb 14 Saxton & Son, Queen Vie on st

LOWE, FREDERICK GEORGE, Bournemouth Feb 8 Stanton & Co, Southampton

LUCAS, EDWARD, New Broad st Feb 14 Janson & Co, College hill

MEDAS, HENRY GEORGE, Gloucester Vizard & Co, Dursley

MOUNTFORD, JOSEPH BOURNE, Tunstall, Staffs, Farmer March 1 Hollinshead, Tunstall

PARKER, ANDREW NELSON, Southampton Feb 15 Hallett & Martin, Southampton

PEARSON, ELIZABETH HARVEY, Winchcombe, Glos Feb 8 Wood, Winchcombe

REIFE, LAURIE, Paris Feb 5 Mellor & Co, Coleman st

SMITH, JOE MARSHALL, Grosvenor st, Grosvenor sq, House Steward Feb 1 Cooper & Bate, Portland st, Portman sq

STANFIELD, WILLIAM FARLEY, Manchester, Licensed Victualler Feb 7 Hockin & Co, Manchester

WALKER, MARGARET, Newmarket on Tyne Feb 17 Swinburne, Gateshead

WARD, SARAH, Waltham Abbey, Essex Jan 19 Jessopp & Gough, Waltham Abbey

WESLEY, WILLIAM, Newtown Linford, Leicester, Farmer Jan 24 Harding & Barnett, Leicester

WHITE, FRANK CARTER, Cambridge Heath, Beer Retailer Feb 8 Sharman, Leytonstone

BANKRUPTCY NOTICES.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, JAN. 10.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

ADAMS, JOHN WILLIAM, Bournemouth, Hardware Dealer
Foote Pet Jan 7 Ord Jan 7

ALLEY, WALTER, Milland, Yorks, Brick Manufacturer
Balfax Pet Jan 6 Ord Jan 6

ALLEN, WILLIAM ALFRED, Bridlington, Ice Cream Vendor
Scarborough Pet Jan 8 Ord Jan 8

ARMSTRONG, JOHN, Belton, nr Thorne, Yorks, Farmer
Sheffield Pet Jan 6 Ord Jan 6

BARNES, J. Builder High Court Pet Nov 21 Ord Jan 7

BAY, EDWARD THOMAS, Shanklin, I of W, Bathing
Machine Proprietor Newport Pet Jan 8 Ord Jan 8

BOWEN, WILLIAM, Southend on Sea, Grocer Chelmsford
Pet Jan 4 Ord Jan 4

BRIDGES, JOHN, Mexborough, Yorks, Grocer Sheffield
Pet Jan 6 Ord Jan 6

CAMPFORD, JAMES STOVILLE, Hampton Wick, Photographer
Kingston, Surrey Pet Dec 30 Ord Dec 30

CARRINGTON, T. B. Savoy House, Strand, Brewer's Valuer
High Court Pet Dec 11 Ord Jan 7

CLARK, SAMUEL JOHN, and WILFRED TITFORD PITCHARD,
Milton st, Printers High Court Pet Jan 9 Ord Jan 7

CLIMSON, JOHN, High Crompton, nr Oldham, Innkeeper
Oldham Pet Jan 8 Ord Jan 8

DARRELL, WILLIAM RICHMOND, Bottesford, Leicester,
Farmer Nottingham Pet Jan 7 Ord Jan 7

DE LA SALLE, GEORGE HENRY, Upper Norwood Barnet
Pet Jan 7 Ord Jan 7

DICKSON, CHARLES MAGNUS ROUTLEDGE, Bottle, nr Liver-
pool, Provision Merchant's Traveller Liverpool Pet
Jan 7 Ord Jan 7

ELLEY, ALBERT, New Brighton, Cheshire, Confectioner
Birkenhead Pet Dec 17 Ord Jan 6

GOLDING, WALTER, Godmanchester, Hunts, Draper Peter-
borough Pet Jan 7 Ord Jan 7

GURDIE, LOUIS, Stoke Newington, House Breaker
Edmonton Pet Dec 6 Ord Jan 6

HALLWELL, CHARLES FREDERICK, Barnoldswick, Yorks,
Corn Miller Halifax Pet Jan 4 Ord Jan 4

HARRIS, WILLIAM, Llannorials, Glam, Colliery Manager
Swansea Pet Jan 6 Ord Jan 6

HARLEY, HARRY, Leicester, Fish Dealer Leicester Pet
Jan 8 Ord Jan 8

HILL, SAMUEL, Old Hill, Staffs, Chain Tester Dudley Pet
Jan 8 Ord Jan 8

HOBSON, HENRY, Salford, Innkeeper Salford Pet Jan 7
Ord Jan 7

HOLLAND, EDWARD JAMES, Leicester, Bookbinder Leicester
Pet Jan 6 Ord Jan 6

JACKSON, PETER JOSEPH, Leeds, Beerhouse Keeper Leeds
Pet Jan 7 Ord Jan 7

LAVENDER, THOMAS, Birkdale, Lancs, Builder Liverpool
Pet Jan 7 Ord Jan 7

LACE, ALEXANDER CUNNING, Bristol, Grocer Bristol
Pet Jan 6 Ord Jan 6

LITTLE, JOHN, Hazel Gill, nr Caldbock, Cumberland,
Husbandman Carlisle Pet Jan 9 Ord Jan 8

MARGUARDT, A. W. Streatham, Commission Agent Wand-
sworth Pet Nov 13 Ord Jan 8

MITCHELL, SAMUEL ERNEST, Skewen, Glam, Painter
Aberystwyth Pet Jan 7 Ord Jan 7

NEED, GEORGE FREDERICK ROPER, Bepton, Suffolk, Agent
Bury St Edmunds Pet Jan 7 Ord Jan 7

PARNOLLA, P. W. St. & Tunbridge Wells High Court Pet
Dec 10 Ord Jan 8

PEDLINGHAM, ANNIE MATILDA, Roath, Cardiff Cardiff
Pet Jan 4 Ord Jan 4

RICHARDS, BARNETT, Kingsland rd, Cabinet Maker High
Court Pet Dec 19 Ord Jan 8

RICKARDS, HENRY JAMES, Warfield, Berks Windsor Pet
Jan 4 Ord Jan 4

SAD, OSWALD, Wroxham, Norfolk, Solicitor Norwich
Pet Jan 6 Ord Jan 6

THOMSON, NORMAN, Richmond Wandsworth Pet Dec 17
Ord Jan 8

TAYTHALL, WILLIAM JOHN, Gwennap, Cornwall, Chemical
Manufacturer Truro Pet Jan 6 Ord Jan 6

TREND, JOSEPH JOHN, DAVID FRANCIS, and GWENILLIAN
JOHN, Sea-sea, Colliery Proprietors Swansea Pet
Jan 8 Ord Jan 8

TYERS, ARTHUR, Wellington, Salop, Milkroller Madeley
Pet Jan 7 Ord Jan 7

WEEKS, HORACE, New Brompton, Kent, Corn Factor
Rochester Pet Jan 4 Ord Jan 4

WILLIAMS, HENRY, Holyhead, Bangor Pet Jan 8 Ord
Jan 8

WILLS, HENRY C. BATES, Builder Wandsworth Pet
Dec 18 Ord Jan 8

WILSON, JOHN WALTER, Morecambe, Auctioneer's Sales-
man Preston Pet Jan 7 Ord Jan 7

WILSON, JOHN HUGH, Sheffield, Shoeing Smith Sheffield
Pet Jan 6 Ord Jan 6

Amended notices substituted for those published in
the London Gazette of Dec 13:

AUGOOD, LAWRENCE ROYAL, N.wich, Fruiterer Norwich
Pet Nov 25 Ord Dec 12

FRUGILL, THOMAS, Holme on Spalding Moor, Yorks, Tailor
Kingston upon Hull Pet Dec 9 Ord Dec 9

Amended notice substituted for that published in the
London Gazette of Dec 17:

AUGOOD, LAWRENCE ROYAL, N.wich, Fruiterer Norwich
Pet Nov 25 Ord Dec 12

EVANS, EVAN, and JOHN ROBERT GRIFFITHS, Llandudno
Junction, Builders Jan 17 at 12 Crypt chbrs, Eastgate
row, Chester

FITCH, WILLIAM BOWEN, Lee Jan 30 at 11.30 24, Rail-
way app, London Bridge

GARRITT, JOHN AUSTIN, Lewisham, Woolen Merchant
Jan 21 at 12 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st

HEDLEY, FRANCIS, West Hartlepool, Boatbuilder Jan 17
at 2.30 Grand Hotel, West Hartlepool

JENNINGS, DAVID, Pontypridd, Glam, Grocer Jan 17 at 3
135, High st, Merthyr Tydfil

JENNINGS, FRANCIS WILLIAM, Diss, Norfolk, General
Merchant Jan 17 at 12 Townhall, Ipswich

JONES, WILLIAM, Bodogtan, Anglesy, Coal Merchant Jan
17 at 12.30 Crypt chbrs, Eastgate row, Chester

LEITCH, JOHN, Stapenhill, Derby, Hosiery Jan 17 at 3
Off Rec, 47, Pall st, Derby

MALLET, WILLIAM, Beedham, Norfolk, Butcher Jan 18
at 1 Off Rec, 8 King's

MANNING, CHARLES CUSHI, Colmworth, Beds, Swing
Proprietor Jan 17 at 12 Off Rec, Bridge st, Northampton

MEE, JOSEPH, New Bedford, Greengrocer Jan 17 at 12
Off Rec, 4, Cas le pl, Park st Nottingham

MILLS, ALBERT GEORGE, Hawkhurst, Kent, Farmer Jan
20 at 3 County Court Office, 24, Cambridge rd, Hat-
tings

MONDELL, FRANK MICHAEL, Arthington, Yorks, Licensed
Victualler Jan 21 at 12 Off Rec, 22, Park row,
Leeds

MURRAY, ROBERT HENDERSON, Dalston, Cumberland,
Farmer Jan 17 at 12 Off Rec, 34, Fisher st, Carle

PARRY, JOSEPH BERNARD, and FRANK PARRY, Hulme,
Manchester, Furniture Manufacturers Jan 17 at 2.30
Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester

RIMANN, WALTER GEORGE, Kingston upon Hull, Commission
Agent Jan 17 at 11 Off Rec, Trinity House, Hull

RUFF, WILLIAM, Colmworth, Beds, Miller and Dealer
Jan 17 at 11.30 Off Rec, Bridge st, Northampton

SHELL, JOHN COBLEY, Upcott, nr Winkleigh, Devon,
Auctioneer Jan 17 at 11.30 Underhill's Railway
Hotel, Exeter

STRIDMAN, EDWIN JOHN, Bures Hamlet, Essex, Baker
Jan 21 at 3.30 Cops Hotel, Colchester

THOMPSON, WILLIAM ROBERT, Southwold, Grocer Jan 17
at Off Rec, 3, King st, Norwich

WATKINSON, O. L. Wool Exchange, Coleman st Jan 22 at
11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st

WEEKS, HORACE, New Brompton, Kent, Corn Factor
Jan 20 at 11.30 115, High st, Rochester

WILLIAMS, JOHN, Aberystwyth, Cardigan, Builder Jan 28
at 11 Townhall, Aberystwyth

WILLIAMS, THOMAS DRAGON, Rhyl, Flint, Builders' Mer-
chant Jan 22 at 12 Off Rec, 33, Victoria st, Liver-
pool

ADJUDICATIONS.

ADAMS, JOHN WILLIAM, Bournemouth, Hardware Dealer
Foote Pet Jan 7 Ord Jan 7

ALLEY, WALTER, Milland, Yorks, Brick Manufacturer
Halifax Pet Jan 6 Ord Jan 6

ARMSTRONG, RICHARD, sen, Sandhurst, Berks, Family
Butcher Reading Pet Nov 21 Ord Dec 31

BAINES, JAMES GOODSON, Syston, Leicester, Gardener
Leicester Pet Dec 6 Ord Jan 7

BAKER, WILLIAM ALFRED, Bridlington, Ice Cream Vendor
Scarborough Pet Jan 8 Ord Jan 8

BARNARD, JOHN, Woodhouse, Belton, nr Thorne, Yorks,
Farmer Sheffield Pet Jan 6 Ord Jan 6

BERRY, EDWARD THOMAS, Shanklin, I of W, Bathing
Machine Proprietor Newport Pet Jan 8 Ord Jan 8

BOWEN, WILLIAM, Southend on Sea, Grocer Chelmsford
Pet Jan 4 Ord Jan 4

BULLOCK JOHN, Mexborough, Yorks, Grocer Sheffield
Pet Jan 6 Ord Jan 6

CAMPFORD, JAMES STOVILLE, Hampton Wick, Photographer
Kingston, Surrey Pet Dec 30 Ord Jan 2

CLIMSON, GEORGE ALBERT, Tedlington, Builder Kingston,
Surrey Pet Dec 3 Ord Jan 7

COLLIER, JOHN, High Crompton, nr Oldham, Farmer
Oldham Pet Jan 8 Ord Jan 8

DARRELL, WILLIAM RICHMOND, Bottesford, Leicester,
Farmer Nottingham Pet Jan 7 Ord Jan 7

GOLDING, WALTER, Godmanchester, Hunts, Draper
Peterborough Pet Jan 7 Ord Jan 7

GUTMAN, JACOB, Graham rd, Hackney, Manufacturer's
Agent High Court Pet Nov 11 Ord Jan 8

HALLWELL, CHARLES FREDERICK, Barnoldswick, Yorks,
Corn Miller Halifax Pet Jan 4 Ord Jan 4

HARDING, THOMAS, Spurstow, Farmer Crews Pet Dec 15
Ord Jan 7

HARRIS, WILLIAM, Llannorials, Colliery Manager Swan-
sea Pet Jan 6 Ord Jan 6

HARLEY, HARRY, Leicester, Grocer Leicester Pet Jan 8
Ord Jan 8

HILL, SAMUEL, Old Hill, Staffs, Chain Tester Dudley
Pet Jan 8 Ord Jan 8

HOBSON, HENRY, Salford, Innkeeper Salford Pet Jan 7 Ord
Jan 7

HOLLS, CHARLES, King st, Hammesmith, Watchmaker
High Court Pet Dec 2 Ord Jan 8

HOLLAND, EDWARD JAMES, Leicester, Journeyman Book-
binder Leicester Pet Jan 6 Ord Jan 6

JACKSON, PETER JOSEPH, Leeds, Beerhouse Keeper Leeds
Pet Jan 7 Ord Jan 7

JENKINS, JAMES FRANK, Ramsgate, Fruiterer Canterbury
Pet Dec 4 Ord Jan 7

KINDER, ARTHUR OSWELL, Forest Gate, Essex, Forge Mer-
chant High Court Pet Dec 7 Ord Jan 6

LIMBRO, DAVID, and EMMAUEL LIMBRO, White's row,
Spita fields, Boot Manufacturers High Court Pet
Dec 11 Ord Jan 8

LITTLE, JOHN HAZEL GILL, nr Caldbock, Cumberland,
Husbandman Carlisle Pet Jan 8 Ord Jan 8

MITCHELL, SAMUEL ERNEST, Skewen, Glam, Painter and
Decorator Aberystwyth Pet Jan 7 Ord Jan 7

NORTON, CHARLES, Birmingham, Baker Birmingham Pet
Dec 31 Ord Jan 7

NUNN, GEORGE FREDERICK ROPER, Bepton, Suffolk, Agent
Bury St Edmunds Pet Jan 7 Ord Jan 7

PAYNE, WALTER SAMUEL and HENRY BATES, Folehill,
Coventry, Engineers Coventry Pet Nov 6 Ord Jan 8

PEDLINGHAM, ANNIE MATILDA, Roath, Cardiff Cardiff Pet
Jan 4 Ord Jan 4

PENCIVAL, CHARLES ALBERT, Swinton, Lancs, Iron Worker
Salford Pet Nov 23 Ord Jan 6

RICKARDS, HENRY JAMES, Warfield, Berks Windsor Pet
Jan 4 Ord Jan 4

THOMPSON, WILLIAM ROBERT, Southwold, Grocer Gt
Yarmouth Pet Dec 18 Ord Jan 7

TREND, JOSEPH JOHN, DAVID FRANCIS, Gwennap, Cornwall, Chemical
Manufacturer Truro Pet Jan 6 Ord Jan 8

TYERS, ARTHUR, Wellington, Salop, Milkroller Madeley,
Salop Pet Jan 7 Ord Jan 7

WEEKS, HORACE, New Brompton, Kent Rochester Pet
Jan 4 Ord Jan 4

WILLIAMS, HENRY, Holyhead, Anglesy Bangor Pet Jan 8
Ord Jan 8

WILSON, JOHN WALTER, Morecambe, Auctioneer's Sales-
man Preston Pet Jan 7 Ord Jan 7

WILSON, JOHN HUGH, Sheffield, Shoeing Smith Sheffield
Pet Jan 6 Ord Jan 6

WORMALD, HERBERT, Southport, Publican's Manager
Manchester Pet Dec 18 Ord Jan 6

YATTA, WILLIAM, and MORRIS GIBBONS, Aberystwyth,
Glam, House Furnishers Pontypridd Pet Dec 14 Ord
Jan 1

Amended notice substituted for that published in
the London Gazette of Dec 13:

FRUGILL, THOMAS, Holme on Spalding Moor, Yorks, Tailor
Kingston upon Hull Pet Dec 9 Ord Dec 9

Amended notice substituted for that published in the
London Gazette of Dec 17:

AUGOOD, LAWRENCE ROYAL, N.wich, Fruiterer Norwich
Pet Nov 25 Ord Dec 12

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, JAN. 14.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

BAILEY, TOM, and JOSEPH WILLIAM WARBURTON, Altrinch-
am, Paleters Manchester Pet Jan 9 Ord Jan 9

BARBER, GEORGE, Upper Lyddbrook, Glos, Grocer Hereford
Pet Jan 10 Ord Jan 10

BELL, JOHN COOPER, Carlisle, Licensed Victualler Carlisle
Pet Jan 9 Ord Jan 9

BINNS, JOSEPH, Halifax, Farmer Halifax Pet Jan 7 Ord
Jan 7

BROOK, BUTTERWORTH, Huddersfield Huddersfield Pet
Jan 8 Ord Jan 8

BUTCHER, GEORGE JENN, Ramsgate, Draper Canterbury
Pet Jan 11 Ord Jan 11

CALDWELL, GEORGE, Nottingham, Photographer Notting-
ham Pet Jan 11 Ord Jan 11

CARR, WALTER, Longbenton, Northumberland, Farmer
Newcastle on Tyne Pet Jan 8 Ord Jan 8

CAWWOOD, HENRY WADSWORTH, Rotherham, York,
Solicitor's Clerk Sheffield Pet Jan 9 Ord Jan 9

CHAFFER, HARRY, Leeds Leeds Pet Jan 10 Ord Jan 10

CHRISTOPHER, THOMAS WILLIAM, Hoveham, Gasfitter
Brighton Pet Jan 10 Ord Jan 10

CORRIE, JOHN, Walford, Builder St Albans Pet Jan 8
Ord Jan 8

CHASTRE, TOM, Manchester, Timber Merchant Manchester
Pet Jan 11 Ord Jan 11

DORSON, FREDERICK, Poulton le Fylde, Lancs, Saddler
Preston Pet Dec 21 Ord Jan 10

DOWSE, HERBERT, Coventry, Tailor Coventry Pet Jan 6
Ord Jan 10

EVANS, JOHN, & SONS, Landore, nr Swansea, Iron Founders
Swansea Pet Jan 11 Ord Jan 11

FRANCIS, JOHN BRANES, Northampton, Boot Upper Manu-
facturer Northampton Pet Jan 10 Ord Jan 10

GOUGH, JAMES BERNARD, Morecambe, Auctioneer Preston
Pet Nov 19 Ord Jan 10

GREENFIELD, NATHAN, Hackney, Boot Manufacturer High
Court Pet Dec 20 Ord Jan 10

HARLTON, WILLIAM, Wigan, Fish Dealer Wigan Pet Jan
10 Ord Jan 10

HEDLEY-SITTER, GEORGE, Mark le, Colliery Agent High
Court Pet Dec 33 Ord Jan 10

HELEBY, ERNEST ARTHUR, Manchester, Cycle Dealer
Manchester Pet Dec 21 Pet Jan 10

HOOKE, ROBERT, Southsea, Cycle Agent Portsmouth
Pet Jan 11 Ord Jan 11

HUDSON, GEORGE COOK, Derby, Builder Derby Pet Jan
11 Ord Jan 11

HUDSON, HENRY PHILIP, Eastbourne Eastbourne Pet Jan
10 Ord Jan 10

JONES, ROBERT, Dwyran, Anglesy, Builder Bangor Pet
Jan 11 Ord Jan 11

JOYCE, CHARLES STEPHEN, and ELLEN JOYCE, Cowes, I of W,
Printers Newport Pet Jan 11 Ord Jan 11

MEDCALF, FRANCIS, Manchester, Fruit Salesman Man-
chester Pet Jan 10 Ord Jan 10

MORGAN, JOHN HERMUS, Deptford, Engineer Greenwich
Pet Jan 10 Ord Jan 10

NEGUS, ARTHUR GEORGE, Surbiton, Surrey, Schoolmaster
Kingston, Surrey Pet Jan 9 Ord Jan 9

READ, WILLIAM HENRY, Olton, Warwick, Brush Manu-
facturer Birmingham Pet Jan 11 Ord Jan 11

REED, WILLIAM ALFRED, Hyde, I of W, Market Gardener
N. wport Pet Jan 10 Ord Jan 10

RIDLEY, MALCOLM, South Benwell, Northumberland, Shoe-
maker Newcastle on Tyne Pet Jan 10 Ord Jan 10

SAVAGE, ALBERT, Southsea, Baker Portsmouth Pet Jan
11 Ord Jan 11

SLACK, RICHARD EDWARD, Sheffield, Butcher Sheffield
Pet Jan 10 Ord Jan 10

SOVER, SAMUEL, Little Alie st, Aldgate, Tobacco Pouch
Manufacturer High Court Pet Jan 9 Ord Jan 9

STOREY, EDITH, Hastings Hastings Pet Jan 9 Ord
Jan 9

STOUTLIFFE, JOHN, Aston Birmingham, Baker Birmingham
Pet Dec 18 Ord Jan 9

TANNING, WILLIAM, Farringdon st, Dining Room Keeper
High Court Pet Jan 9 Ord Jan 9

TRENBLE, RAFFAELLA, West Hartlepool, Ice Cream Dealer
Sunderland Pet Oct 29 Ord Jan 10

TERRY, ALFRED UCHIL, Tontowen, Kent, Jeweller Hat-
tings Pet Jan 9 Ord Jan 9

THOMAS, R. S. & H. Cardiff, Cabinet Makers Cardiff Ord
Jan 8

TROTT, ALBERT, Luton, Cycle Maker Luton Pet Ja
Ord Jan 10

WALKER, ANNIE, Bradford, Draper Bradford Pet Jan 9
Ord Jan 9
WHITAKER, ALFRED JAMES PENTON, Minehead, Somerset,
Chartered Accountant Cardiff Pet Oct 3 Ord Jan 9
WILLIAMS, CLIFF, Folkestone, Upholsterer Canterbury
Pet Jan 11 Ord Jan 11

FIRST MEETINGS.

ALTMAN, CALMAN, Gt Grimsby, Watchmaker Jan 21 at 11
Off Rec, 15, Osborne st, Gt Grimsby
BARFORD, ALBERT, Rochdale, Licensed Victualler Jan 21
at 11.15 Towhall, Rochdale
BARWARD, JOHN, Bolton, nr Thorne, York, Farmer Jan 23
at 12 Off Rec, Figtree ln, Sheffield
BEAUMONT, CHARLES, Oldham, Joiner Jan 21 at 11 Off
Rec, Bank chmbrs, Queen st, Oldham
BIRN, EDWARD THOMAS, Shanklin, I of W, Bathing
Machine Proprietor Jan 27 at 3 Off Rec, 19, Quay st,
Newport I of W
BROOK, BUTTERWORTH, Huddersfield Jan 22 at 11 Off
Rec, 19, John William st, Huddersfield
BYGOTT, WILLIAM JOHN, Hartlepool, Newagent Jan 21 at
3 Off Rec, 25, John st, Sunderland
BYWATER, HENRY THOMAS, Wolverhampton, Professor of
Music Jan 22 at 11 Off Rec, Wolverhampton
CARR, WALTER, Longbenton, Northumberland, Farmer
Jan 21 at 11.30 Off Rec, 30, Mosley st, Newcastle on
Tyne
CORRIE, JOHN, Watford, Builder Jan 23 at 8 Off Rec,
95, Temple chmbrs, Temple av
DAVIES, HENRY, Liverpool, Piano Dealer Jan 22 at 2 Off
Rec, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool
FINE, DANIEL, Aberaman Glam, Furnisher Jan 22 at 2
135, High st, Merthyr Tydfil
GRIFFITHS, PHILIP, Swansea, Licensed Victualler Jan 21
at 12 Off Rec, 31, Alexandra rd, Swansea
GRUNDL, LOUIS, Stoke Newington, House Breaker Jan 23
at 12 Off Rec, 30, Temple chmbrs, Temple av
HARTER, WILLIAM HENRY, Doncaster, Licensed Victualler
Jan 21 at 11 Off Rec, Figtree ln, Sheffield
HOBSON, HENRY, Salford, Innkeeper Jan 22 at 2.30 Off
Rec, Byrom st, Manchester
HOLLAND, EDWARD JAMES, Leicester, Journeyman Book-
binder Jan 21 at 12.30 Off Rec, 1, Berridge st,
Leicester
JACKSON, PETER JOSEPH, Leeds, Beerhouse Keeper Jan 21
at 11 Off Rec, 22, Park row, Leeds
JONES, KATE, Edgmont, Birmingham, Restaurant Keeper
Jan 21 at 12 Crypt chmbrs, Eastgate row, Chester
JONES, RICHARD, Walspool, Montgomery, Wool Merchant,
Jan 22 at 11.30 Oak Hotel, Walspool
KENT, HENRY, Egham, Surrey, Engineer Jan 22 at 11.30
24, Railway app, London Bridge
LEACH, ALEXANDER GUNNING, Bristol, Grocer Jan 22 at
11.30 Off Rec, 26, Baldwin st, Bristol
NORTON, CHARLES, Birmingham, Baker Jan 23 at 11 174,
Corporation st, Birmingham
PHILLIPS, GEORGE WILLIAM, Harrow rd, Property Manager
Jan 23 at 12 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
ROBERTS, SAMUEL, Camden Town, Watchmaker Jan 27
at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
ROWLAND, CHARLES HENRY, Swindon, Wilts, Grocer Jan
23 at 11 Off Rec, 28, Regent circus, Swindon
SADD, OSWALD, Wrexham, Norfolk, Solicitor Jan 21 at
12.30 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich
FOVIE, SAMUEL, Aldgate, Tobacco Pouch Manufacturer
Jan 23 at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
THOMSON, MALCOLM EDWARD, Northampton, Surgeon
Jan 22 at 12 Off Rec, Bridge st, Northampton
TUCKER, GEORGE ARTHUR, Shanklin, I of W, Hardware
Merchant Jan 21 at 12 Off Rec, 19, Quay st, New-
port
TWIGG, EDWARD, Sheffield, Carting Contractor Jan 21 at
11.30 Off Rec, Figtree ln, Sheffield
WALKER, ANNIE Bradford, Draper Jan 23 at 11 Off
81, Moor row, Bradford
WHITE, WILLIAM, Ryde, I of W, Corn Dealer Jan 21 at
11.15 Off Rec, 19, Quay st, Newport, I of W
WILSON, JOHN HUGH, Sheffield, Journeying Shoehing Smith
Jan 21 at 12 Off Rec, Figtree ln, Sheffield
YAPPA & GIBBS, Abercromby, Glam, House Furnishers
Jan 22 at 12 135, High st, Merthyr Tydfil

Amended notice substituted for that published in
the London Gazette of Jan 10:

JENNINGS, FRANCIS WILLIAM, Diss, Norfolk, Malster
Jan 17 at 12 Great White Horse Hotel, Ipswich

ADJUDICATIONS.

AVERY, EDWARD, Dean st, Soho, Bookseller High Court
Pet Nov 9 Ord Jan 9
BAILEY, TOM, and JOSEPH WILLIAM WARBURTON, Altrinch-
ham, Painters Manchester Pet Jan 9 Ord Jan 10
BARBER, GEORGE, Upper Lydbrook, Glos, Grocer Hereford
Pet Jan 10 Ord Jan 10
BELL, JOHN COWEN, Carlisle, Licensed Victualler Carlisle
Pet Jan 9 Ord Jan 9
BINES, JOSEPH, Halifax, Farmer Halifax Pet Jan 7 Ord
Jan 7
BISHOP, ARTHUR, Walthamstow, Builder High Court Pet
Nov 21 Ord Jan 11
BROOK, BUTTERWORTH, Huddersfield Huddersfield Pet
Jan 8 Ord Jan 8
BUTCHER, GEORGE JOHN, Ramsgate, Draper Canterbury
Pet Jan 11 Ord Jan 11
CALDWELL, GEORGE, Nottingham, Photographer Notting-
ham Pet Jan 11 Ord Jan 11
CARR, WALTER, Longbenton, Northumberland, Farmer
Newcastle on Tyne Pet Jan 9 Ord Jan 10
CAWWOOD, HENRY WADSWORTH, Rotherham, Solicitor's
Clerk Sheffield Pet Jan 9 Ord Jan 9
CHAPPEL, HARRY, Leeds Pet Jan 10 Ord Jan 10
CHRISTOPHER, THOMAS WILLIAM, Horham, Sussex,
Gasfitter Brighton Pet Jan 10 Ord Jan 11
CORNISH JOHN, Watford, Build'r St Albans Pet Jan 8
Ord Jan 8
CRABTREE, TOM, Manchester, Timber Merchant Manchester
Pet Jan 11 Ord Jan 11
DOVE, HENRY CHARLES, Southampton, Builder South-
ampton Pet Dec 21 Ord Jan 11
DOWSE, HERBERT, Coventry, Tailor Coventry Pet Jan 6
Ord Jan 6
FRANK, MAX, Australian av, Cripplegate High Court Pet
Nov 5 Ord Jan 10
FRASER, JOHN, Laurence Pountney hill, Merchant High
Court Pet May 8 Ord Jan 10
FUGGLE, G H, Broadstairs High Cou t Pet Nov 19 Ord
Jan 9
GOODCHILD, DAVID DANIEL, Hackney, Trimming Manu-
facturer High Court Pet Dec 19 Ord Jan 10
GRUNDL, LOUIS, Stoke Newington, House Breaker
Edmonton Pet Dec 6 Ord Jan 8
GRUNDLAND, PIZA, Camden Town, Tobacconist High Court
Pet Dec 2 Ord Jan 9
HAIRSWORTH, EDWARD JAMES Storrington, Sussex High
Court Pet Nov 21 Ord Jan 11
HARLTON, WILLIAM, Wigan, Fish Dealer Wigan Pet
Jan 10 Ord Jan 10
HOOKER, ROBERT, Southsea, Cycle Agent Portsmouth Pet
Jan 11 Ord Jan 11
HORNE, GEORGE WALTER, Kensington, Mining Engineer
High Court Pet Dec 9 Ord Jan 10
HUDSON, GEORGE COOK, Derby, Builder Derby Pet Jan
11 Ord Jan 11
JONES, ROBERT, Dwyran, Anglesea, Builder Bangor Pet
Jan 11 Ord Jan 11
JOYCE, CHARLES STEPHEN, and ELLEN JOYCE, Cowes, I of
W, Printers Newport Pet Jan 11 Ord Jan 11
KENT, HENRY, Egham, Surrey, Engineer Kingston,
Surrey Pet Jan 3 Ord Jan 8
MEDCALFE, FRANCIS, Manchester, Fruit Salesman Man-
chester Pet Jan 10 Ord Jan 10
NEGUS, ARTHUR GEORGE, Surbiton, Surrey, Schoolmaster
Kingston, Surrey Pet Jan 9 Ord Jan 9
PRICE, CHARLES HENRY, Birmingham, Baker Birmingham
Pet Dec 19 Ord Jan 11
REED, WILLIAM ALFRED, Ryde, I of W, Market Gardener
Newport Pet Jan 10 Ord Jan 10
RICHARDSON, JAMES FRANCIS, and ROBERT COOKE, Man-
chester Solicitors Manchester Pet Nov 1 Ord
Jan 11
SAVAGE, ALBERT, Southsea, Baker Portsmouth Pet
Jan 11 Ord Jan 11
SLACK, RICHARD EDMUND, Sheffield, Butcher Sheffield
Pet Jan 10 Ord Jan 10
STOREY, EDITH, Hastings Hastings Pet Jan 9 Ord
Jan 11
SWALLOW, ROBERT, Brighton, Coal Merchant Brighton
Ord Jan 9
TERRY, ALFRED ORIEL, Tunderden, Kent, Jeweller Hastings
Pet Jan 9 Ord Jan 9
WILLIAMS, CLIFF, Folkestone, Upholsterer Canterbury
Pet Jan 11 Ord Jan 11
WOODWARD, JOHN, Birmingham, Pork Butcher Birmingham
Pet Dec 19 Ord Jan 10

Just published, royal 8vo, price 10s. 6d.

SIMONSON ON THE RECONSTRUC-
TION AND AMALGAMATION OF
JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

Being a Treatise on the Law relating to the Reconstruc-
tion and Amalgamation of Joint Stock Companies,
with Forms and Precedents.

By PAUL F. SIMONSON, M.A. (Oxon.), of the Inner
Temple, Barrister-at-Law, Author of a "Treatise on
the Law relating to Debentures and Debenture Stock."
"A very large section of lawyers are interested deeply in
this subject, and all such will find it well worth their while
to invest in the work under review. The author is a well-
known specialist and safe guide on such subjects as his
previous works testify. No less than forty forms are given,
these should prove of great service."—Irish Law Times.

Just published, royal 8vo, price 5s.

THE COMPANIES ACT, 1900. With
Commentaries and Forms, Second Edition. By
PAUL F. SIMONSON, M.A. (Oxon.).

"We would call attention to the admirable index, which
will render reference an easy matter."—Law Times.
"Gives a lucid explanation of the various clauses of this
important measure."—Morning Post.
"An admirable elucidation of the Act. Mr. Simonson
has made a study of the legal aspects of company matters,
and is the author of the well-known treatise on the law
relating to debentures."—Standard.

A TREATISE ON COMPANY LAW
UNDER THE ACTS 1862-1900.

By G. F. EMERY, LL.M., of the Inner Temple, Barrister-
at-Law. Price 21s.

"The whole field of company law under the Acts 1862-1900
is covered, and each particular portion is exhaustively
treated."—Law Times.
"Good in every sense of the word is the work under
review. The Index of Cases is one of the most perfect we
remember to have come across."—Law Notes.
"Very rare indeed is it to find a legal handbook which
throws so much illumination on the subject it treats."
Yorkshire Post.

MARITIME LAW. Illustrated by the

History of a Ship from and including the agreement
to build her until she becomes a total loss. By
ALBERT SAUNDERS. Price 21s.

"The plan is well adapted to show the application of the
law to the facts. Mr. Saunders shows a thorough grasp
of the law and a wide knowledge of the practical side of
shipping."—Law Magazine.
"An interesting, readable, and a valuable exposition of
an important branch of the law, upon which the author may
be heartily congratulated."—Daily News.

EFFINGHAM WILSON,

11, Royal Exchange, E.C.

SWEET & MAXWELL, LTD.,
Chancery Lane, W.C.

ST. THOMAS'S HOSPITAL, S.E.,

NEEDS HELP.

J. G. WAINWRIGHT, Treasurer.

MESSRS. INDERMAUR & THWAITES

(Editors of the "Law Students' Journal," &c., &c.,
22, Chancery-lane, London, W.C.), continue to read with
Students both in Class and Privately and through the Fee
for the Solicitors' Final and Intermediate Examinations
and for the Bar Final. Particulars personally or by letter.
Note.—Pupils have the use of a set of rooms and the
library at 22, Chancery-lane, for study during the day.
November Honours, 1900.—The 1st (Clements'-inn) and
Daniel Beardon Prizeman and Winner of the Travels-
Smith Scholarship was a four months' pupil.

MR. C. SPURLING, M.A., B.C.L. (Oxford),
First Class Honours, late Scholar of Christ Church,
Editor of the Eleventh Edition of "Smith's Common
Law," Barrister-at-Law, continues to PREPARE for the
Bar and University Law Examinations by Day, Evening,
or Post.

Bar Examinations, 1901.—103 sent up, 85 passed, 14
obtaining a Second Class.
University Examinations, 1901.—12 sent up, all passed.
Address, 11, New-court, Carey-street, W.C.

MR. F. F. MONTAGUE, LL.B., continues
to PREPARE for the SOLICITORS' FINAL and
INTERMEDIATE EXAMINATIONS; to assist principal or
to manage; skilled draftsman; salary moderate; well
recommended.—Title, 702, Romford-road, Manor Park, E.

LAW.—Re-engagement Wanted in a City
Office by Practical Middle-aged Conveyancer (not a
solicitor) of considerable experience; to assist principal or
to manage; skilled draftsman; salary moderate; well
recommended.—Title, 702, Romford-road, Manor Park, E.

EQUITY AND LAW
LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

ESTABLISHED 1844.

Funds exceed - - - £3,600,000.

LONG-TERM POLICIES AT LOW RATES, with right to change
to Ordinary Assurances, thus giving

THE CHEAPEST ASSURANCE PROCURABLE.

Write for NEW PROSPECTUS, containing full information and other important
alterations, to

SECRETARY, 18, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, LONDON.